BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

PURCHASED WITH THE INCOME OF THE FUND
GIVEN BY

FREDERICK MADGE
1820-1908

SON OF THE REV. THOS. MADGE, 1786-1870, OF
ESSEX STREET CHAPEL, LONDON, 1825-1859

THE

CHRISTIAN TEACHER;

A

THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY JOURNAL.

VOLUME SIXTH.

NEW SERIES.

LONDON:

JOHN CHAPMAN, 121, NEWGATE STREET;

LIVERPOOL: WILLMER AND SMITH—MANCHESTER: T. FORREST.

1844.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY RICHARD KINDER,
GREEN ARBOUR COURT, OLD BAILEY.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME VI.

NEW SERIES.

NUMBER XXIII.

ART.		PAGE
I.	The English Universities. From the German of V. A. Huber. An abridged Translation, edited by F. W. Newman. 3 vols. London. 1843	1
II.	Memoirs and Correspondence of Francis Horner, M.P.	19
III.	Endeavours after the Christian Life. A Volume of Discourses. By James Martineau	38
IV.	Neander on the Free Teaching of Theology	52
V.	Recent Works on the Atonement:—	
	1. Letters to a Friend on the Doctrines of the Trinity and the Atonement. By George Walker	68
	2. Four Discourses on the Sacrifice and Priesthood of Jesus Christ. By John Pye Smith, D.D.	71
	3. Letters to the Rev. John Pye Smith, D.D., occasioned by the recent publication of his Four Discourses. By George Vance Smith, B.A.	73
	4. Lectures on the Scripture Doctrine of Atonement or of Reconciliation through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. By the late Lant Carpenter, LL.D.	78
VI.	Dewey's Discourse on the Character and Writings of Rev. W. E. Channing, D.D.	83
VII.	Notices of New Publications:—	
	1. A Prayer Bell for the Universal Church. By Walter C. Perry Ph. D.	92
	2. An active and enlightened Laity, essential to the prosperity of the Christian Church. A Discourse on occasion of the Death of George William Wood, Esq., M.P. By John James Taylor, B.A.	95
	3. The Supremacy of the One God the Father, Vindicated. By the Rev. John Harrison, Ph. D.	100
	4. The Authority of Scripture, with respect to addressing Prayer and Worship to the Lord Jesus Christ. By Herman Heinfetter	101
	5. The Tests of Time: a Story of Social Life. By Sara Wood.	102
	6. A Discourse, in commemoration of the Life and Character of Rev. Henry Ware, jun., D.D. By Chandler Robbins	102
VIII.	Our Reviewers Reviewed:—	
	1. The Book Department of the Unitarian Association	112
	2. Holy Songs and Musical Prayers	118

1 Jac 8 Highan 1

5749

NUMBER XXIV.

ART. PAGE

I.—Neander on the Free Teaching of Theology 127
II.—Contributions to the Edinburgh Review. By Francis Jeffery . 140
III.—Life in the Sick Room. Essays. By an Invalid . . . 153
IV.—Memoirs of the Life of Lord Sydenham 181
V.—A Supplementary Report on the Results of a Special Inquiry into the practice of Interments in Towns. By Edwin Chadwick, Esq. 190
VI.—What's to be done? or Past, Present and Future. London: Ridgway 194
VII.—The Critical and Miscellaneous Writings of Theodore Parker . 212
VIII.—Religious Union with Intellectual Freedom; a Letter. By John Taylor 222
IX.—Holy Songs and Musical Prayers 231
X.—The Book Department of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association 234

NUMBER XXV.

I.—Popular Education in Europe. Seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts . . . 237
II.—Mental Hygiene. By William Sweetser, M.D. . . . 255
III.—Lectures on certain High Church Principles, commonly designated by the term Puseyism. By Thomas Madge . . 267
IV.—Poverty and its Remedies 275
V.—Retrenchment of the Hours of Business 288
VI.—Human Nature. London: John Chapman, 1844 . . . 302
VII.—Dissenters' Chapels Act 318
VIII.—Notices of New Publications:—
1. Walter Bernard: a Wesleyan Methodist's Inquiries into the object of the Sufferings of Christ 337
2. A Sermon on Flowers. By Rev. R. E. B. Maclellan . . 340
3. A Treatise on Grammatical Punctuation. By John Wilson . 342
4. Hymn to the Week above every Week, Passion Week. By Thomas Hornblower Gill 343
5. An Apology for Religious Union on Christian Principles, in Letters addressed to the Rev. John Taylor, of Glasgow. By John Gordon 349

NUMBER XXVI.

I.—Unitarianism: its Present Duties and Prospects . . . 357
II.—Logic, Reason, and Revelation 365
III.—Education: The Chevalier Paulet and his System . . . 376
IV.—The Inspiration of Scripture 387
V.—Translations of the New Testament 401
VI.—The Claims of Labour 413
VII.—Essays on the Pursuit of Truth and on the Progress of Knowledge. By Samuel Bailey 431
VIII.—The Mutual Dependence of Men in a Social State . . . 336
IX.—Joseph Barker's Tracts 443
X.—Sermons on the Dissenters' Chapels Act 457

THE

CHRISTIAN TEACHER.

ART. I.—THE ENGLISH UNIVERSITIES. From the German of V. A. Huber, Professor of Western Literature at Marburg. An abridged Translation, edited by Francis William Newman, Professor of the Greek and Latin Classics at Manchester New College, and formerly Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. Two vols. 8vo, in three parts. London: 1843.

IT is a remarkable, but by no means a singular, or unaccountable circumstance, that our Universities should have allowed a foreigner to lead the way, in relating their history and pointing out the relation in which they stand to the other institutions of England. Perhaps a resident member of either University is not the best qualified for the latter of these offices; but it might at least have been expected that abundant leisure, the command of libraries and documents, joined to filial affection towards their Alma Mater, would have prompted some Oxford or Cambridge man, to give us, if not a philosophical history, continuous Annals of his University. We need not now inquire why this natural expectation has been disappointed, and the labours of Wood and Fuller have neither been carried on by succeeding antiquaries, nor applied to a higher use than their authors were capable of giving to them. The excellent George Dyer's Works on the History and Privileges of the University of Cambridge, though they do not deserve the unmeasured contempt with which Huber speaks of them, influenced possibly by their *reforming* spirit, which he so much dislikes, are meagre and ill-arranged. We are not aware that Oxford has had any historian from whom either a native or a foreigner could satisfactorily learn what was its condition, external and internal, at

the commencement of the present century, or what changes have since taken place in it.

Of the author of the present work we know nothing beyond what he himself has told us, that he is Professor of Western Literature at Marburg, and that he has paid three several visits to Oxford, and resided a considerable time in England. It is hardly necessary to say of a German, that he has neglected no means within his reach of making the historical portion of his work accurate and full. But he has also obtained a very correct insight into the national institutions and character of England, and though he sometimes judges us severely, as in his remarks on the *cant* which, he says, taints all our conventional language on the subject of morals and religion, we meet with none of those instances of gross and ludicrous ignorance, which a Frenchman usually exhibits when he writes about this country. His book is therefore a valuable addition to our historical libraries. We cannot say much for its attractions to a general reader. The extent of the obligation which we owe to the Translator and the Editor for condensing, recasting, and curtailing the original could only be estimated by a laborious comparison of the English with the German work; we doubt not that it is great. But there is still a heaviness in the general effect, and an uncouth rudeness in the style,* more especially when the author deals in metaphor. His earnestness leads him into the occasional assumption of a very dogmatic tone, which we could fancy to have been caught from the perusal of Niebuhr's writings, whose strong and passionate convictions sometimes vented themselves in harsh censures of those who might doubt or dissent. Sometimes, too, we think that Professor Huber is misled by his love of new combinations (an *ignis fatuus* of the modern school of History), to imagine relations which do not exist, and strain analogies beyond the truth. Thus, having described the old division between *Northernmen* and *Southernmen* at the Universities, and shown its effects as late as the seventeenth century, he goes on to observe that it still continues to manifest itself; that Liberalism has its seat in the North, and Toryism in the South, and that "at every shaft which strikes an English University, men's eyes instinctively turn northward for the bowman who shot it."—i. p. 87, 88. The rudeness which long marked the North of England, as compared with the South, and which produced the peculiar characteristics of the men of that region, when they became members of

* The translator may have something to answer for: "*Fruitful monographic stuff*," T. ii. p. 115, note, for "fruitful materials for a monograph," is rather too close an imitation of the German.

the Universities, was the effect of its later civilization; the descendants of the Brigantes submitted slowly to the authority of law and its natural results. When the Welsh began to resort in considerable numbers to Oxford, they espoused the same party as the Northernmen, and supported it by the same violent means.—i. p. 359, note. The modern Liberalism of the North of England (for Scotland must not be confounded with it merely from proximity) has been owing to the rise of manufactures there, itself the result neither of ethnological nor political causes, but of the abundance of coal and its application to machinery. The sharpest flight of arrows which has rattled on the University of Oxford in our times, was shot from behind the shield of a Northern Review; but of the three bowmen, the Rev. Sydney Smith, Mr. Payne Knight, and Professor Playfair, the last only was a *Northernman*.

Professor Huber writes with high admiration of our English Universities, and especially of Oxford, which, indeed, appears best known to him. This may surprise us in a foreigner, and especially the native of a country in which Academical Education is so differently carried on. He expresses himself, too, with unwarrantable bitterness of the party who seek for University Reform, and whose success he believes to be more imminent and more dangerous than we at all apprehend it to be. Paradoxical as it may seem to our readers, who have been accustomed to regard Oxford as the citadel of Toryism, we believe that a secret longing for the freedom, *which no academical teacher in Germany enjoys*, prompts his admiration for our more independent establishments. We know not what may be the relation between the University of Marburg and the ruling powers of the State; Hesse Cassel has not been celebrated for the wisdom or liberality of its government; at all events the fate of Dahlmann and his colleagues, in the neighbouring kingdom of Hanover, shows how frail is the tenure by which academical teachers hold their liberty of speech and action. If those regulations are still in force, which the Congress of Carlsbad enacted, when alarmed at the prevalence of democratic tendencies at the Universities, every Professor is liable to have his class-room visited by a delegate from the Diet, that the tenour of his teaching may be known, and must submit to him, if required, the compendium or notes from which he lectures. Or if these degrading regulations have fallen into disuse, it has been because public teachers have felt the necessity of anticipating them, and have, in general, been careful to give no umbrage to the State. Several passages in Huber's work show how deeply he feels and resents this tyrannical control; *e. g.* i. p. 290, where he is speaking of the

condition of the Universities, after some strict regulations made by Commissioners in the reign of Queen Mary, and of privileges granted them at the same time :—

"But with all these advantages, the state of things continued to be, upon the whole, as lamentable as in the previous period. The number of Doctor's Degrees in the six years of this reign were, in Divinity three, in Laws eleven, in Medicine six; while the Masters of Arts, in each year, varied from fifteen to twenty-seven.

"The cause of this failure is easy to discover. The Universities had everything except the most necessary element of all, FREEDOM; which, by the immutable laws of Nature, is always an indispensable condition of real and permanent prosperity in the higher intellectual cultivation and its organs. In vain has brute force at every time sought, for the sake of some political aim, to thwart this law of nature; those shadowy beings, scientific officers and corporations, can never become a substitute for the genuine and wholesome energy of life. If we can do without this energy, it were better not to lose time and trouble in expensive experiments for infusing a galvanic existence. But if the true and natural life be needed, then let its prerequisite be granted—Mental Freedom." —i. p. 290—1.

Now whatever shackles the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge bear, imposed by themselves or by the State in former times, they are practically exempt from such servitude as the continental governments impose. The visitorial power of the Crown, the imperial authority of Parliament, exist indeed in the Constitution, but in practice are a nullity. No Royal Mandate goes forth, for any more weighty purpose than the honorary creation of a Doctor; and the utmost that a reformed House of Commons could accomplish, was to send up a measure of University regulation, to be stifled by the Peers. England, which we commonly call a Monarchy, and which Huber considers as a Republic, is a curious bundle of organizations, ultimately dependent on and controlled by the state, but each within its sphere acting by its own impulse, and rarely interfered with by any extraneous power. Our ecclesiastical and municipal corporations, our schools, Colleges, and Universities, are virtually subordinate to Chancery or the King's Bench, to Parliament or the Crown, and gross abuse or illegal assumption is ultimately checked. But the slow process by which any offending body is made to feel the displeasure of the supreme authority is very different from the electro-magnetic rapidity with which in Germany absolute power strikes the objects of its dislike. With us, as long as the individual teacher transgresses no law of the land, he is safe from the law, and his academical superiors can only proceed against him by forms long established, and for offences recognized and

defined. The Professor in Germany, if he promulgate free doctrines, does it with the rod suspended over him, and without any definite warning for what cause it may be inflicted. Such a condition cannot but be irksome to any man of a free spirit, and our author appears to have thought that neglect of duty towards the State on the part of an University, arising from the absence of control, is a less evil than such a degrading pupillage.

The appearance of this work in an English dress is due to the liberality of Mr. James Heywood, who has also contributed some valuable matter to the appendix. His known zeal for University Reform, and for the removal of that injustice, which denied him the honour of a degree, except on condition of renouncing his Nonconformity, leads us to conclude that his primary object has been to awaken attention to the state of the Universities, and procure the improvement of their laws, discipline and studies. We fear that he has not adopted a very promising mode of attaining this object. The bulk of the work, and those qualities of the style which we have already noticed, tend to prevent it from being popularly read, notwithstanding the illustrations by which he has endeavoured to relieve its dryness. As the Author is strongly opposed to University Reform, except in his own peculiar way, which is not likely to satisfy any party, it has been found necessary to counteract his text by notes, in which the Editor corrects his statements or controverts his reasoning. Could Mr. Heywood have prevailed on Mr. Newman to have given in a distinct form to the world, the excellent matter which now lies scattered through his Preface, and his Notes on the text and Notes on the Appendix, we think that an impression would have been made upon the public mind, in favour of the object which Mr. Heywood has at heart, which we cannot anticipate from this translation. His personal knowledge of Oxford would have prevented the repetition of the outcry, so often raised against the advocates of a change—that they know nothing of the system which they seek to amend; and the sound sense, and deep religious and moral feeling which his remarks display, would have been far more efficacious in producing conviction, without the incumbrance of a controversial form.

We do not suppose that our readers would feel much interest in the mere antiquarian history of the Universities, though in itself a most important part of the general history of England in the Middle Ages. It would be impossible to present an abridgment of that which has been already so much abridged by the author and the editor. The most remarkable circumstance, and one which continues to this day, to influence the whole

being and working of both Universities, is the gradual absorption of the properly Academic body, by the Colleges which were originally subsidiary to it. An University is properly an incorporated body of teachers invested with the power of giving a license to teach, and as such may exist, like the University of Edinburgh at this moment, without any provision for the accommodation of students. The establishment of that of London has pared away still further the notion of an University, and shown that it may exist for the mere purpose of conferring degrees even without an incorporation of teachers. But wherever an University arose in the Middle Ages there commonly arose also colleges, in which at first poorer students received gratuitous support, and others were subsequently placed that they might be safer from the dangers which attended promiscuous lodging in the cities in which Universities were established. The *Halls* differed from the Colleges by not being endowed with any revenues for gratuitous maintenance, and being more immediately dependent on the University. From this circumstance, the Halls were naturally far more numerous than the Colleges; and at the beginning of the 14th century, when there were 300 of the former at Oxford, there were only three of the latter. Two centuries later the Halls had been diminished to little more than fifty, while the Colleges had risen to twelve, and the same tendencies continuing on both sides, the Halls became almost extinct, while the colleges went on multiplying their numbers and increasing their wealth. The diminution in the numbers of students in the University coincident with the decay of the Halls, is attributed to the decline of the scholastic philosophy which had attracted such crowds in earlier times, as well as to the political condition of England during the 15th century. The Colleges had not originally been establishments for instruction, and in this respect differed from the Colleges of Paris for example, which were Universities in miniature; and while the University instruction continued to flourish, the Fellow was under no compulsion to teach the under-graduates. Huber thinks that the great increase in the relative importance of the Colleges, the first decided step towards their drawing to themselves the whole system of *education*, leaving nothing to the University beyond the conferring of degrees, was occasioned by the revival of classical learning and philological study. This is not very clearly made out, for there seems no reason why this taste should not have manifested itself in eagerness to hear the lectures of public professors. In fact a number of new professorships were instituted in the end of the 15th, and beginning of the 16th centuries; yet the relative importance of the University was not

recovered, and through all the vicissitudes which have since occurred, the same process has steadily gone on. The state, which by the Reformation acquired a steady control over the Universities, perceived how favourable the oligarchal dominion of the Colleges was to the maintenance of its authority, and the suppression of all democratic movement. New regulations were therefore made, by which all University discipline, and even the exercise of the literary functions of the University was transferred to the heads of Colleges. The University had always been powerless in regard to the Colleges, which were subject to direct control only from their own visitors: it now lost even its indirect influence upon them, and became virtually a mechanism moved by them. The Colleges themselves grew more oligarchal in their constitution; the Head, properly only *primus inter pares*, became in fact almost absolute in the meetings of the Fellows; the Fellows took to themselves exclusively the office of College Tutors. And the Board of Heads at Oxford and the Caput at Cambridge acquired by law the complete management of University affairs, and even the controul of legislation, by their negative before debate, on all matters to be discussed in Convocation or Senate.

For this assumption of power, the Colleges and their Heads have been most vehemently assailed (see Ed. Rev. 1831, p. 384, foll.), as if it were an act of mere usurpation. It has certainly encouraged the ruling body to consider itself as irresponsible, and it opposes the strongest possible barrier to the influence of the public mind upon them. But we think that Huber is right in considering it rather as the slow result of circumstances, and as justified by the immediate effect, internal harmony, discipline and order. It is in analogy with the course which the political institutions of the country followed during the corresponding period; but it has lasted longer than political and municipal oligarchy, because it comprehended the power to stifle dicussion, as well as to controul action. And we may add that it is so perfectly adapted to self-perpetuation, that here above all, external interference is needed, to give a beginning to a better system. To give increased efficacy to the *University* Lectures as distinguished from the College lessons, has been the wish of the reforming party; new Professorships have been established for the more modern and popular branches of knowledge, and Huber thinks that these lectures assume a much greater prominence than they had before. (ii. 355.) Mr. Newman thinks otherwise, and the probability of the case appears to be with him. University honours are to be attained only by proficiency in *College* study, and these honours will attract the

most energetic minds, whether their ambition be academical or secular.

The most interesting part of this work is the second division of the eleventh chapter p. 282-418, in which the author treats of the Intellectual and Moral State of the Universities after the Revolution and through the eighteenth century, and in the most recent times. With a single exception, which we shall notice hereafter, its tone is apologetic and laudatory. He thinks lightly of their alleged immoralities; rejects, as proceeding from simplicity or cant, the statement of their present high condition of moral purity; and is quite satisfied that the little world of a College should, in this respect, be about upon a level with the great world in which its members will soon bear a part.

His editor takes much higher ground:—

"If ever they are to deserve veneration, their moral atmosphere must be purer and more healthy than that of the mixed world—not by any formal restraints, but by higher influences and sympathies; and Professor Huber's defence of them, because they are (or were?) *only something worse* than the world, is to me highly offensive. With the great advantages which they enjoy in England, I believe they ought to be eminent alike in a moral and in an intellectual view; and if they are not, it is to the discredit—not perhaps of any one individual who can be named—but of the whole system. To inculcate the necessity of their corruption is to paralyze all efforts at improvement. Rather let every person in official power there count that nothing is done, until he is able to invite his friends (cordially, and without 'Cant') to send their sons to the Universities as to Schools of Virtue, if not of piety: and those who with simplicity of heart, and without mawkish or false morality, aim at this end, will have all the aid which Parents or the Legislature can give them;—will be 'acceptable to God and approved of men.'"—ii. pp. 520—1.

Huber's answer to the most common charge against the Universities, that they have neglected to afford the means of instruction to those whom they have enjoyed a monopoly of training, we must give in his own words:—

"On the whole, it appears that the English Universities in the last century, without aspiring to any high or ideal standard of literary eminence, sufficed for the age and people. Whatever may have been their deficiencies, the reproach and the responsibility must fall principally *upon the whole national state.* Had not the two, in all essential points, been in close sympathies, it would have very speedily evinced itself in a country as free as England. We can find no trace, however, of such symptoms at that period; for the censures of a few individuals, however just, cannot be taken into account. If people choose to reject the whole national condition, as indefensible and bad, either absolutely or in comparison with others, nothing more can be said, except to protest that such an

opinion cannot be justified by the facts of the case. *We*, at least, cannot admit the justice of this opinion. It is very true that a portion of public opinion, both in England and on the Continent, has lately been taking a direction which certainly tends to a thorough contempt of England as she was; but certainly at that time none looked at her from this point of view, but the tendency was to overvalue her general and public state. Even the most violent of the opposition party, in their attacks, did but vent the spleen in which men think they have a right to indulge towards those nearly attached to them: nor did either Whigs or Tories mean to attack old England as a whole and fundamentally, or to breathe a doubt of her high pre-eminence among civilized nations. When not only England itself, but all Europe, looked upon the state of England,—especially those higher departments which are so much influenced by the Universities,—as most gratifying and honorable, or even as the very noblest fruit of European civilization, how can we make the English Universities responsible for not coming up to the demands of after-times, made among other nations, and under a perfectly different state of things? With all his defects, foibles, and faults, the Old English Gentleman was one of the most striking and admirable forms of civilized national education in any period of time, or in any nation; and it was, in fact, this race which ruled and represented England in the last period. To them she principally owes her power, her glory, and her importance; and they were essentially the production of the University education, University studies, and University life of that period. This is fully sufficient to prove the English Universities to have been, upon the whole, excellent organs for influencing the development of the nation, and thereby of the whole human race."—ii. pp. 345—8.

We add Mr. Newman's comment:—

"If this *proof* is addressed to that part of our nation which desires an extensive enlargement of the sphere of University teaching (and whom, on that account, our Author invidiously and unjustly names Enemies of the Universities), there is not a passage in his work which will be to them so unsatisfactory as this. The country is at this moment suffering unparalleled distress (May 1842), after twenty-six years of peace. Nor is there a question, among inquiring men, that it is produced through the neglect and ignorance of former Legislators. What is the right remedy, is much debated, and I am not about to assume here that any one *party* takes the right view. One says, that the Church has not received due development and due pecuniary help; another, that our Commercial Code has been iniquitous and pernicious; a third, that laws for the regulations of Factories and Mines ought to have been passed: a fourth, that the Poor Laws have been ill contrived:—all however agree, that the past generations of Legislators have, by ignorance or neglect, left us an awful load of misery and consequent vice; threatening the country with results, which are most deprecated by that party which was in power while they were being generated. To appeal to such results in proof of the success of the University system of the

last century, would be, *in a native Englishman,* nothing short of infatuation; in a German it is pardonable. That to the example of our aristocracy, our soldiers and sailors owe no small part of their bravery, will be cheerfully admitted; but our farmers, our merchants, our manufacturers, our shopkeepers, owe no part of their wealth to the legislative sagacity of our parliament: and for *what* have our peasants and operatives to thank English legislation?"—p. 347, note.

Elsewhere Huber says (p. 320), "The English Universities content themselves with producing the first and most distinctive flower of the national life, a *well educated 'Gentleman.'*" Now certainly if this be the vocation of the Universities, it is one to which they have been self-called. The deeds of their founders, their charters and statutes, express plainly enough the purposes for which they were established and endowed. They are, the advancement of religion, learning, and morals, not the *production of squires.* He adds also, *the formation of schoolmasters.* It is true that the Universities have supplied masters to our public schools, and that in the Southern part of the island, scarcely any scholastic instruction was for a long time valued, except that which was given by University men. It is not less true, that we owe to this very circumstance the deficiencies of the school education of England, even in its most splendid establishments, and the obstinacy with which every attempt to improve and enlarge it was long successfully resisted. The Universities may be said to form our Schoolmasters, because, partly from the restrictive stipulations in the deeds of foundation of our Grammar Schools, partly from the preference given to the clergy of the Established Church, it is almost necessary to graduate there in order to become a schoolmaster. But what has the University done to qualify the schoolmaster specifically for his office, which is commonly included in the idea of *forming*? Nothing whatever. It has been content to send him forth to learn his art as he best could.

The extreme defectiveness of the instruction in Theology at the Universities, Professor Huber does not deny or palliate, and he proposes a singular theory to explain it. (Vol. ii. p. 67.) According to him, the complete abolition of scientific Theology, which is to this day so deeply marked a feature in them, was owing to the difficult position in which Laud and the High Churchmen of his day felt themselves; they were really Arminians, yet had to pay deference to Articles which were Calvinistic, and to prevent that freedom of controversy which must have exposed the hollowness and inconsistency of their system, and destroyed the superficial unity of the Anglican Church. Hence they set the example of discountenancing all

theological discussion. Wood relates, that one Master was punished in 1630 for attacking the Synod of Dort, and another for attacking the Arminian clergy. Our author may perhaps attribute this motive too definitely to Laud, and too much influence on succeeding ages to his example; but the discouragement of Theology was the natural consequence of the genius and position of the Anglican Church. Its policy has always been, like that of Walpole's Administration, not to move things that are at rest. It had gathered the most wealthy and important part of the nation together, in outward adherence to a system of doctrine, in which consistency was sacrificed to comprehension; and while the nation has been content to slumber on, it has never been the interest of the Church to waken them. The only exception in the seventeenth century was during the Protectorate, when much more freedom of theological discussion was allowed than under the Stuarts. The slight revival of theological study which has taken place in our own times, has been forced upon the Church by the absolute necessity of defending herself. In truth, it is vain to expect that any energetic study of Theology should take place, while the Universities continue to be overridden by the Church, and the Church to be shackled by subscription. What motive can there be to a pursuit, the results of which are superfluous, if they coincide with the foregone conclusion of the Articles, and embarassing if they are at variance with it?

Professor Huber further considers the question of the claims of Dissidents from the Anglican Church to be admitted to the Universities, and, as might be anticipated, decides against them. Assuming, without argument and against all probability, that the abolition of Test-oaths would lead to the exclusion of Anglicanism from the Universities,* he thinks their present possessors are clearly entitled, by the natural right of self-defence, to exclude Dissenters; nay, if they appear to harbour the design of themselves occupying that place, which others now hold, "to disarm, to banish, to extirpate them." These extravagant positions he defends only by the shallow sophisms which have been so often produced in this and similar questions of Reform, Parliamentary, Municipal, Legal, or Charitable, confounding a Trust with Property. There is a violence and asperity in his language on this subject, so unsuitable both to the philosophical pretensions of his work, and to the actual relation between the Universities and the Dissenters, that we conclude him to have

* "To demand the keys of a fortress is really to demand possession. Now the Thirty-nine Articles are the keys to the *Anglican* Universities."—ii. p. 397. All that the Dissenters ask, however, is not to be *searched at the gates.*

written under the prolonged influence of feelings, which in England have already died away. If his last visit to Oxford were paid some twelve years ago, as some internal marks lead us to conjecture, no doubt he found there both panic and exasperation. The democratic torrent which had been rising for several years, had attained a height which threatened to overflow the Universities, and sweep all before it. Hordes of rapacious radicals seemed ready to seize on their property, or illiterate *industrialists* to convert them into a higher kind of Mechanics' Institutes. Regius Professors sat uneasily in their chairs, and Canons of Christ Church trembled in their stalls. Not only were the pluralist and the sinecurist alarmed at the threats of reform, but the most active and conscientious were appalled at the probable effect of the permanent ascendancy of the popular party, excited to hostility against the Universities by their habitual adherence to the Church, the Aristocracy, and the Crown, and their recent opposition to the Reform Bill. These feelings have subsided as the torrent has shrunk again within its bed, but they seem still to live in the mind of Professor Huber. At Oxford and Cambridge there can be nothing like fear of radicals or Dissenters at the present moment. We infer this, among other proofs, from the moderate tone in which Parliament discussed, during the last session, the same question which excited such stormy passions in 1834. The advocates of the exclusion of Dissenters from the Universities were angry then, because they thought themselves in danger; they are calm now, because they believe themselves secure. Indeed it must be evident, that if the walls of the *fortress* are destined to suffer any breach, it will not be by a battery from without, but the explosion of the combustibles within.

But though Professor Huber is so determined an enemy of all external reform as to declare Parliamentary interference with the Universities "a political robbery and murder," "as long as the smallest minority even formally maintains the Articles and the Creed" (ii. p. 414), he has still "somewhat against them." "They have left their first love;" they have allowed the Evangelical doctrines of the Reformation to fall into such a state of inactivity and abeyance, as to produce most fearful effects on the religious state of England. As a proof of this he appeals to our modern literature, and to that part of it which proceeds from men who belong to the Anglican Church and party. "It will be found every instant, that the essence of Christianity—THE SINFULNESS OF MAN and THE REDEMPTION —is taken in a mere conventional light, and that a vague sort

of Deism, a *self-complacent justification*, is the true ground of their whole tendency."—ii. p. 405. Elsewhere speaking of the Church, with which he identifies the Universities, he says, "She has certainly avoided the *Scylla* of Catholicism; but (to say nothing of Arminianism) has she also avoided the *Charybdis* of Indifference, of apostacy from the fundamental principles of the Reformation, nay, of Christianity? Those only who are themselves included in this apostacy would say that she has escaped it. But even these admit, yea, boast, that Unitarianism, for instance, though openly avowed by few, is secretly held by vast numbers, nominally members of the Church."—ii. p. 51.*

"All unprejudiced witnesses agree, that there prevails at the Universities, as in the Church to which they belong, a want of Christian faith, of intimate knowledge of fundamental truths of Christianity, or, at all events, a want of *lively* faith, a confusion and levelling of ideas, a dry formality, a sort of moral self-justification or negligence, a complete predominance of the material and political interests of the Church, and a reckless worldly-mindedness connected with it."—ii. p. 406. This, it seems, is the spiritual and moral condition of the Universities, even after all the supposed reforms which have taken place. Truly, if "Puritans, Unitarians, Atheists, or what not," as our Author enumerates them, had controlled their destinies since the Reformation, they could hardly have fallen into a state more deplorable than that into which their orthodox guardians have brought them. The remedy is, that Evangelical doctrine should be revived and preserved; this is the only condition on which the Author promises them safety. But how is this to be effected? The Articles, which, sooner or later, every member of the University must subscribe, are, in our Author's view, the very standard of Evangelical doctrine, and this fearful state of

* Mr. Newman observes in his note on this passage, "On the head of Unitarianism, English readers will probably judge his statement to be exceedingly exaggerated. Since the abolition of the Test Acts, avowed Unitarianism seems to have vanished from within the pale of the Church; and who can pretend to know that which is unavowed?" Unitarianism has a positive and a negative form. In the latter it may fairly be reckoned to include all who dissent from the Athanasian doctrine of the Trinity, the only standard of Church orthodoxy, and in this sense we have no doubt, that "vast numbers" within the Establishment are Unitarians; and they would more readily avow it to a foreigner than a fellow-countryman. In the former, it is commonly identical with *humanitarianism*, and is not increasing, either within or without the Church. We believe, however, that this has neither been coincident in time, nor connected in causation with the Repeal of the Test Acts, which, perhaps, Mr. Newman has inadvertently confounded with the Penal Laws against Unitarians. The prevalence of a negative rather than a positive form of Unitarianism, joined with other causes, some political, some fashionable, may explain why the spirit which led to the foundation of the Essex Street Chapel is so nearly extinct among the lay members of the Church.

degeneracy has been produced in spite of them. He appears inclined to seek the remedy in the greater freedom of theological teaching, and though embarassed by its results in Germany, in producing Rationalism,* the object not only of his disapprobation but his hatred, thinks this, upon the whole, the less evil of the two. But what kind of freedom would he allow? Freedom to prove all things—to submit every doctrine of the Church to the test of Biblical Criticism, History, and Philosophy? or only freedom to the mind to exercise itself in the collateral paths of theological learning, under the restriction that every dogma established at the Reformation is to be respected? This would be a most unsatisfactory substitute for the true liberty in which alone the principle of moral and intellectual life can be sustained. He has, indeed, some unrevealed secret (ii. p. 412, note) as to the manner in which knowledge and faith are to maintain their respective rights, and if by Faith is meant only the religious principle in its largest sense, no one can doubt that they may exist in perfect harmony. But if it is identified with assent to the Thirty-nine Articles, or any other dogmatic symbol, then Faith, and the progressive knowledge which results from free inquiry and teaching, will continue to be, as they have always hitherto been found, *res dissociabiles*. They were wise in their generation, therefore, who prescribed in the Oxford Statute of 1616 (ii. p. 69), "In the Catechetical Lectures usually held in the separate Colleges or Halls, let the Thirty-nine Articles of the year 1572 be read; let them be expounded by texts of Holy Writ, and firmly corroborated by testimonies of Ancient Fathers and Councils." This is a sound practical view of clerical education; and by this method, varied according to circumstances, Oxford, Edinburgh, and Maynooth train their respective students, and perpetuate their own standard of Catholic or Evangelical doctrine.

It is time, however, that we direct the attention of our readers to Mr. Newman's Preface. He has been induced to enter more largely into the question of University Reform, in consequence of Professor Huber's expressing some displeasure at the notes which he has in various places annexed to the Translation, for the purpose of correcting the erroneous statements or reasonings of the Author. That a foreigner should be open to this correction from one who had been for eight years a member of the University was to be expected; but the difference between the Author and the Editor extends much beyond this. The point of view from which they respectively consider all questions

* "Rationalist Ratbane," as he calls it with a happy alliteration.

affecting the duties of the Universities, and their actual influence on society, and the consequent necessity or inutility of Reform is essentially different. Professor Huber is well satisfied with what the Universities have done, and deems it no part of their duty to lead the age in any onward movement, or endeavour to raise the moral or intellectual standard of the nation. Mr. Newman considers them rather bound by their pre-eminent rank, their concentration of ability, and their close connexion with Religion to guide and improve the national mind and conscience. Professor Huber regards it as their chief office in regard to the state to uphold existing institutions, and present a broad and solid dam to the flood of democratic encroachments. Mr. Newman would make them calm and impartial mediators between the parties whose embittered contests threaten to rend society asunder.

"The mass of the nation is learning, by a succession of experiments, to hope much from the fears, and little from the justice or wisdom of those in power; and there is no umpire left between rich and poor 'to lay his hand upon us both.' If it is too early for thoughtful men to ask, what is to save our children from Civil War, it, at least, is not too early to inquire, whither we are to look for that profound, tranquil, unbiassed Political Wisdom, which becomes the more essential for our welfare, the more our population increases in density, our social relations in complexity, and our whole civil state in advancement. *Such* wisdom must rest on a broad surface of History, and be deeply grounded on a knowledge of the moral, social, and spiritual nature of Man. It can be no fruit of the genius of an individual, but the net result of the experience of ages, and of the activity of ten thousand intellects; and, as such, it would diffuse itself, not as a set of propositions based on the authority of a few eminent Professors, but as a spirit breathing through the whole minds of those who have access to its abode. Now this is the political side of the ideal, which I form of the Universities; this is, I think, the political part which the Nation needs them to play. Such a Function is essential for the permanent welfare of the Body corporate; and it seems impossible to point out any other national Organ, by which the function could be executed."—pp. xi. xii.

The question respecting the admission of Dissenters to the Universities, Professor Huber summarily disposed of, by considering such admission as equivalent to the surrender of the fortresses of the Anglican Church to her enemies. Mr. Newman admits, that, speaking abstractedly, he acquiesces in the argument, that everybody ought to be admitted both to the studies and to the degrees of a National University; but cannot desire an immediate change, against the will of those who at present hold academical authority. Perhaps we should not inquire too

strictly of him, why, for the sake of individual feeling, concrete injustice should thus be preferred to abstract justice; it is but natural that any compulsion exercised towards his Alma Mater should seem to him to savour of impiety. He holds more decided language respecting the demand of subscription to the Articles from the holders of all places of academical emolument or profit:—

"I cannot have the slightest sympathy with an argument, which really (however unconsciously) postpones the interests of truth to those of power; which acknowledges that the subscriptions are not believed, in any vital or practical sense; which attacks the Universities as not diffusing an evangelical savour through their instructions; which predicts that the subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles could not be repealed without producing the widest spread of avowed unbelief in them among those who are at present bound by them;—and therefore vehemently opposes the repeal. If the facts are true, I cannot conceive a stronger proof that an immediate repeal is absolutely necessary; for at present a mere hollow hypocrisy is fostered (according to this admission) in the heart of those institutions to which we ought to look for Truth, and the Love of Truth. What consolation is it to inform us that an external ceremony of subscription is still retained,* if the entire system of profession is a standing lie? Those who think they can refute the assertion, that the current doctrine diffused by the Universities among their lay members has no vital affinity with the Thirty-nine Articles,—may reply to our Author on this ground. I am satisfied with urging, that the more cogently he can demonstrate the fearful results of abolishing the subscription, so much the more fearful does he prove the maintenance of it to be."—pp. xiv. xv.

Whether subscription to the Articles shall be retained as a preliminary to matriculation or graduation, Mr. Newman says elsewhere is "more a Churchman's than a Dissenter's question." —Vol. ii. p. 395, note. We think the Dissenters would do well so to consider it, and leave it to be settled by Churchmen among themselves. If any considerable number of them feel themselves to be aggrieved by it, they will easily obtain the removal of the grievance; if not, there is something officious in our zeal to relieve those who do not feel themselves under a burden. As Dissenters we have *now* very little interest in claiming for ourselves facilities of admission to Oxford and Cambridge for the mere purpose of graduation. When Parliament refused to open this path for us to academical degrees, the State, by the foundation of the University of London supplied us with another. Our endeavours,

* "See Vol. ii. p. 316, where our Author has *virtually* the same sentiment. If I did not refer to this, he might think I was unjust to him: but I cannot understand how to reconcile his conflicting declarations."

we think, should be directed to the encouragement of that Institution and its offsets planted among ourselves. Its studies are best adapted to our wants; it imposes no burdens on our consciences, and holds out no temptations to our integrity. Were all direct temptations of this kind at the elder Universities removed, the influence of the place and its associations would remain, and any increased resort of our youth thither, would but increase the power of those causes which are at work, disintegrating and dissolving the old forms of Dissent. We would not use education as the means of extending or preserving our own religious opinions, but we do not wish to put this weapon into the hands of others, to be used against ourselves.

Mr. Newman concludes his preface, as we shall do this article, with an affectionate and earnest exhortation to the Universities, to deserve the respect and gratitude of the nation, by banishing all unworthy feelings, and adapting themselves to the exigencies of the Age.

"In the University of Oxford I have received much undeserved, unsolicited, disinterested kindness: and (except that in every personal retrospect matter of regret and humiliation will mix itself up), the remembrance of my residence there excites in me nothing but gratitude and affection. Alas! that the amiableness of individuals cannot atone for the inadequacy of the system to the present state of Knowledge and of Need. If for the last two centuries the Universities had grown healthily and moderately, no faster change might perhaps be now requisite than actually went on for thirty years together: but they need a more than juvenile vigour—such as can only be gained by either new elements or new organs—to expand proportionally to the free intellect which has been formed without them, and every day wins upon them. In order therefore that they may recover their lost intellectual leadership, a friendly but decisive acting *upon* them appears to me quite essential. I would fain hope that no Englishman who loves the Universities will adopt a fiction, which will exasperate enemies, and will (in the hour of danger) be repudiated by pretended friends;—that the Universities are a private possession. The Institutions of our country cannot become such, any more than our soil, however loaded with benefactions by private enterprise and good will: and as for the wild talk of some, that they will rather destroy the Universities than allow them to be reformed; we might as well propose to swamp our fruitful fields, to burn our forests, to choke our harbours; because the coming generation desired to use them according to its free judgment, as we have used them according to ours. Tradition and precedent have immense power in all countries: in England most remarkably so: and there is little danger of a flood of innovation, unless fertilising streams be unwisely dammed up. The admirable material structure of our noble Universities, the broad basis which unnumbered zealous benefactors have laid, the schools connected with them which spread over the whole kingdom, the sympathies

and venerable remembrances with which their names are entwined, give them substance for a perpetual youth, co-enduring with the energies of the British nation, the prime talent of which they will long have the means of picking; while the high political place which they hold, enables them to act with the cautious gravity, by which alone they can retain permanent veneration. Only may Party-Spirit not mar their high powers and promise: may the favour of Princes not make them fancy that their greatness is unassailable: nor their eye be so bent on the remote past, as to be blind to the wants of the present, and the signs of the future!"—p. xxxiv.-xxxvi.

K.

ART. II.—MEMOIRS AND CORRESPONDENCE OF FRANCIS HORNER, M.P. Edited by his brother, Leonard Horner, Esq., F.R.S. 2 vols. 8vo. London.

THE species of biography, peculiar to modern times, and necessarily restricted to persons of some literary habits, which consists in selections from their correspondence arranged so as to form a continuous narrative of their lives, and interwoven perhaps with the entries of a journal, possesses many of the advantages of a professed autobiography, without its peculiar evils. Perhaps it is not going too far to say, that the worst autobiography that was ever produced, if it only professes to give the reader some insight into the character of the author, is better adapted for that purpose than the best biographical work written by any one else. The author can, at all events, if he chooses, tell you the truth about himself; he can enter into his own past feelings, and can represent the influences by which he was surrounded, in the manner in which they really appeared to himself. And probably he will have no motive to do otherwise, at least with respect to nine-tenths of the actions of his life; unless he is a very vain man—and vanity is so quickly seen through, that perhaps the vainest men, those who are most anxious to conceal their defects and magnify their merits, are precisely those whom, if they will only speak, only say something or other, we can estimate the most justly. And then the remaining one tenth will almost always expose itself, in spite of the author's reluctance. His silence, his unusual reserve, his prevarication perhaps, or the earnestness with which he dwells on unimportant particulars, will themselves betray him, if there is anything discreditable to himself which he wishes to conceal or palliate.

His biographer on the contrary can but partially, at best, understand a different nature from his own. That sympathy which is the only key to the hidden feelings of another, is necessarily imperfect in many points. Then there are many facts of which the biographer must be ignorant, though perhaps they would account for some otherwise inexplicable feature in the character he is attempting to delineate. Hence almost all biography has the appearance of groping in the dark. The writer seems to confess his ignorance by the vagueness of the terms he employs, as well as by the eagerness with which he catches at any minute circumstance which he fancies is characteristic. And even when he himself has chanced upon something like a clear notion of the

character, his readers get it tinged by the medium it has passed through, so that, to understand biography, the first requisite is an intimate knowledge of the writer. If so many submit to this unsatisfactory process, and find a pleasure in it, and continue it perseveringly, it can only be on account of the great value which they all set upon the prize they hope to gain by it, the genuine comprehension of some one character. The study of human nature is so interesting, that we are content to go on pursuing it, even while we are sensible that we are making but little progress.

On the other hand, however, when any one sits down to write an account of his own life, it becomes as difficult for him to avoid putting on a set manner, different from his every day style of thinking and speaking, as for one sitting for his portrait to avoid putting on a set look. Egotism and affectation become companions which he cannot easily shake off while he is upon such an occupation. Hence there is more danger, paradoxical as it may seem, of his giving us too unfavourable, than too favourable an impression of himself. We are disgusted at the affectation, and seldom consider that the quality may be appropriate, less to the man than, to the nature of his work. Of course there are exceptions, and we have no doubt there are, or have been, persons possessing that genius which authorizes an autobiography, and at the same time of such a temperament as to overcome these defects, and to be capable of writing a history of themselves that would be invaluable. Sir Samuel Romilly might be safely named as an example. But in general a course such as that adopted in editing Romilly's Memoirs, and in the work before us, is a safer and an equally satisfactory mode of exhibiting a man's genius and disposition. We are informed by the Editor that the plan of the work has been "by a careful selection from the papers and correspondence, by the addition of a few pages at the commencement and close, and by filling up occasional blanks in the course of the narrative, to make my brother himself narrate the history of his life." There seem to be no other disadvantages in a biography thus composed, in ordinary cases, than such as may easily be overcome by an attentive reader, and indeed should serve only to stimulate his activity. He has himself to perform a considerable part of what are generally looked upon as the functions of the biographer. He has to find out what are the prominent points on which his attention should be fixed, and to trace the various characteristic passages that are scattered over the volumes, and by combining or contrasting them to frame for himself a notion of the character he is studying: in place of which troublesome

processes, he may depend on finding, in reading ordinary biographies, a complete character drawn out, in the usual place, with a proper attention to antithesis. If he has patience for this, he may be sure that he will be rewarded with a juster and a fuller knowledge than he could have obtained by the passive perusal of the best written life. Since a man's character is infinitely better learnt from his writings, than from what other men say about him, or even from what he says about himself; and from none of his writings better than his Diary and his familiar letters.

At the same time it is not every one whose life could be satisfactorily narrated in this way. It is of course to say that the subject for such a work must be one who has had friends at a distance to whom he has been in the habit of communicating his actions and feelings, and speaking openly. Then he must be one, of whom it is more important to know what he *is*, than what he *has done*. A life of Wellington, for instance, could not well be written after this fashion. For, not to say that every man stands too close to obtain a complete view of his own actions, especially when they are on a large scale and extend over a length of time, it is at all events clear that he is not the proper person to speak of them. And even in reading these volumes, there is danger of our underrating Mr. Horner's services in the question of the currency, simply from their not being brought prominently enough before our eyes. It would not be natural in any one, least of all in so modest a man as Mr. Horner, to trumpet his own praises in such a case as this; yet from some quarter or other, they ought to make themselves heard.

The correspondence is the most interesting part of the work. It is very copious, and of itself would be almost sufficient without any other aid to form a complete narrative of Mr. Horner's life, though we are informed that only about one-third has been published of the letters which are in the Editor's possession. Some of the remainder, we may be allowed to hope, will one day see the light. The journal on the contrary is not nearly so valuable as either that of Mackintosh or of Romilly, whether we regard it as so much material for estimating Mr. Horner's character, or in any other light. It is almost exclusively confined to his studies; and it extends over a shorter period. He commenced it at an earlier age, and therefore probably did not think it worth his while to prefix, as they have done, a narrative of his boyhood and youth: so that we are unable to trace the gradual development of his intellect, or, what would be of still more value, of his moral principles. They come upon us full-fledged, or at least firmly cast and hardened into that shape and

those tendencies which they retained throughout his life. He appears before our eyes, at first, a youth of twenty, with an ardent and unwearied love of study which carries him into the remotest tracts of knowledge, and leads him into inquiries too desultory, and literary schemes too extensive, to be carried out satisfactorily. Even at so early an age his intellect had gained the mastery over his imagination. He took more delight, we are told, in the exertions of reason than the excursions of fancy. The magnificence of York Minster seems to have made a very slight impression on his imagination; and in the account he gives of a day spent in York, the Cathedral only occupies the smaller half of a sentence which is divided between that edifice and the jail. All enthusiasm appears to him a mere debauchery of the imagination. Strong good sense and vigorous power of reasoning formed the intellectual characteristics of the young Scotchman. To these we may add a remarkable shrewdness in the appreciation of character. He had no wit, and like many of his countrymen seems to have been a little deficient in the sense of the ridiculous, or to speak more correctly, the sense which distinguishes between jest and earnest. The Rev. Sydney Smith relates the following anecdote:—"He loved truth so much, that he never could bear any jesting upon important subjects. I remember one evening the late Lord Dudley and myself pretended to justify the conduct of the Government in stealing the Danish fleet; we carried the argument with some wickedness against our graver friend; he could not stand it, but bolted indignantly out of the room: we flung up the sash, and with loud peals of laughter professed ourselves decided Scandinavians; we offered him not only the ships, but all the shot, powder, cordage, and even the biscuit, if he would come back: but nothing would turn him; he went home, and it took us a fortnight of serious behaviour before we were forgiven." The amiable disposition and equable temper which distinguished him through life are very apparent in the letters of this period: and those addressed to his father are particularly pleasing, as showing an openness and freedom from restraint in the intercourse between father and son, such as evinces a regulated habit of kindness on the part of one, appreciated and well responded to by the other. The picture is completed by Mr. Sydney Smith. "There was something very remarkable in his countenance. The commandments were written on his face, and I have often told him there was not a crime which he might not commit with impunity, as no judge or jury who saw him, would give the smallest degree of credit to any evidence against him; there was in his look a calm settled love of all that was honourable and good—an air of wisdom and sweetness."

Such is the first appearance of Francis Horner, in these volumes. There is nothing in all this to distinguish him from many other steady and studious youths, who have grown up into very common-place men. He had not the acute sensibility of Romilly, which invested his pleasures and his griefs, his hopes and his apprehensions, with an intensity not belonging to those of ordinary men; a sensibility which, to whatever painful results it may lead occasionally, is yet on the whole a boon to be grateful for, and would seem to be the necessary accompaniment of Genius. He was not apparently endowed with any remarkable quickness of conception; nor is there any thing brilliant or very original in his writings or speeches. It was only by steady persevering labour, and by the force of an irreproachable reputation, that he reached so fair an eminence, and was enabled to have his name connected with so many valuable public services, and to obtain so rare and honourable a tribute as that which was paid to his memory in the House of Commons by his political opponents as well as friends. The example is thus the more useful, as being within the reach of almost every one.

Francis Horner was the son of an Edinburgh Merchant. After going through the usual routine of Edinburgh education, he spent two years with the Rev. J. Hewlett, at Shacklewell, in Middlesex, for the purpose chiefly of acquiring the English accent, an accomplishment which it seems is considered desirable for those who are to plead even in the Scotch Courts of Law. This gentleman appears to have directed his pupil's studies with good judgment, and to have understood his character thoroughly. After two or three years practising in the Courts of Edinburgh, Mr. Horner resolved on changing the Scotch for the English bar. He accordingly came to London, and was introduced into the society of Mackintosh, Sharp, Romilly, and the leaders of the Whig party. This part of the work abounds with very interesting anecdotes. It was in the last days of Pitt and Fox, and there are several descriptions of the debates at which Mr. Horner was present, from among which we extract the following account of the debate on the Bills "for the Defence of the Country," in which the Addington Ministry was attacked at once by the two rival statesmen. It is in a letter to Mr. Horner's father.

"I was at the door of the House by half-past eight; so that we had a pretty good sit of it, till three in the morning. But we were fully rewarded. I have not read the report in the *Morning Chronicle*, but if

it is no better than they have been of late, you will receive but a feeble impression of the debate. Fox's opening speech was not eloquent; on the contrary, slovenly as to manner, and languid; probably from an express intention to restrain himself on personal topics, that he might not anticipate Pitt in this respect. He did not allude to Ministers, but confined himself to the inadequacy of the present arrangements for national defence, and the means of improving them into a permanent system by a better plan of recruiting, and by regulations for military exercise among the peasantry. All the substance of his speech was excellent. Pitt gave us both substance and manner, as a debater of the highest powers. Most explicit in his declaration against Ministers, which he delivered, however, as if at last, after much consideration and reluctance. But he enforced it with a good deal of grave vehement declamation in his way, and some touches of that bitter freezing sarcasm, which everybody agrees is his most original talent, and appears, indeed, most natural to him. His speech was very argumentative and full of details. Throughout, the impression he left was, and he disguised very successfully his anxiety to make this impression, that every measure Government had adopted for the national defence originated from his suggestions, which they had marred, however, by adopting them imperfectly, and carrying them still worse into execution. The speeches of Ministers were confined, till the Attorney-General rose, to the defence of the different parts of their military measures that had been attacked. Perceval took a much more judicious view of the debate, and treated the motion as if it had been in terms for the dismissal of Ministers. This was the true mode of treating it, if he could have executed his idea with skill; but his want of talent drove him to violence and extreme personality, so as to betray the fury and despair of his friends, or rather their convulsions in death. His personal abuse of Fox and Wyndham was vulgar and gross in the extreme. But we in the gallery were much indebted to him, for it produced a masterly speech from each in their very different styles. Wyndham repelled the personality, chiefly by the contrast of his own manner; with great fire, but perfect temper, a very polite contempt, and exquisite wit. He spoke not more than ten minutes, but he refreshed one's mind from all the bad feelings that Perceval had given us. Fox treated him after a different regimen, condemning with much vehemence and indignation the faction and ribaldry which he had introduced into the debate, and defending his own political connexions and conduct with all the manliness and simplicity of his best manner. It is very likely that so soon after the great entertainment I have had, I may be talking of it in a manner that you will suppose exaggerated; but if it is so, you will know how to make allowances. One feature of the debate I must not forget; the fulsome adulation paid by Tierney and Perceval to Pitt; the latter of whom said that no event would be more agreeable to the country than his return to power—a very strange expression to use in such circumstances. After such a division as that of last night, nobody conceives the Doctor can any longer remain at the head."—Vol. i. p. 248.

The following critique on Sir William Grant's style occurs in an account of a subsequent debate. There is a great deal of truth in it, though it may be doubted whether Mr. Horner does justice to Sir William's great powers of language.

"There was one extraordinary oration that night—Sir William Grant's; quite a master-piece of his peculiar and miraculous manner. Conceive an hour and a half of syllogisms strung together in the closest tissue, so artfully clear that you think every successive inference unavoidable, so rapid that you have no leisure to reflect where you have been brought from, or to see where you are to be carried, and so dry of ornament, or illustration, or refreshment, that the attention is stretched —stretched—racked. All this is done without a single note. And yet, while I acknowledge the great vigour of understanding displayed in such performances, I have a heresy of my own about Grant's speaking. It does not appear to me of a parliamentary cast, nor suited to the discussions of a political assembly. The effect he produces is amazement at his power, not the impression of his subject; now this is a mortal symptom. Besides this, he gives me a suspicion of sophistry, which haunts me through the whole deduction. Though I have nothing immediately to produce, I feel dissatisfied as if there was something that might be said. And after all there are no trains of syllogism nor processes of intricate distinctions in subjects that are properly political. The wisdom, as well as the common feelings that belong to such subjects, lie upon the surface in a few plain and broad lines. There is a want of genius in being very ingenious about them, and it belongs to talents of the second order to proceed with a great apparatus of reasoning."—Vol. i. p. 284.

Soon after Mr. Horner had taken up his residence in London, he found himself invited to take some prominent share in politics. Several of his friends in Edinburgh endeavoured to dissuade him from entering the House of Commons in case a seat should be offered him, and from interfering in any way in political matters. They wished that he should, for the present, concentrate all his energies in the study of the law,—a study, however, which never seems to have been very much to his taste. The dry details which the lawyer has to accumulate in his memory were for a long time very repugnant to him. His fondness was for systems of general reasoning, and hence Political Economy was always one of his favourite studies. He looked to the law merely as the means of gaining a pecuniary independence, and had none of the enthusiasm with which the recondite charms of law seem always to inspire her genuine votaries; charms, perhaps, which are heightened in their eyes from their revealing themselves but to the chosen few, and from the difficulty with which even these unveil them. His

ambition was directed, not to Westminster Hall, but to St. Stephen's. His own views on the subject will be read with some interest.

"Almost from my first entrance upon the study of law, I considered politics as an ultimate object and a concurring occupation. Political adventure is a game which I am disqualified from playing by many circumstances of my character, and which I am resolved to decline. But some share in public business, acquired by reputation, and supported on an independent footing, is a fair object, and almost the only reward that stimulates me to the law. Without belonging to a party, there can be no efficient participation in public affairs. If an honourable man sees no formed party among the factions of the state by whom his general ideas of policy are maintained, he will shrink from them all, and attempt only individual efforts to explain and enforce his views. But in the general maxims and principles of Mr. Fox's party, both in regard to the doctrine of the constitution, to foreign policy, and to the modes of internal legislation, I recognize those to which I have been led by the results of my own reflection, and by the tenor of my philosophic education. And I am ambitious to co-operate with that party in labouring to realize those enlightened principles in the government of our own country; however I lament some violences and mistakes in the conduct of Opposition on particular occasions, and however much I suspect the characters of some who have at times been very near Mr. Fox's person. All my feelings carry me towards that party, and all my principles confirm the predilection. Into that party, therefore, I resolutely enlist myself, with very feeble hopes of its ever being for any long period triumphant in power. There is a low prudence in rearing the fabric of one's fortunes, which fixes the ambition (if it may be called by so proud a name) in the actual possession of places and emolument. And there are some living instances which prove this to be quite a sure game, provided there are never any compunctious visitings of principle or personal regard. There is a more virtuous discretion which limits a man's schemes of exertion to his professional sphere, and to the honest accumulation of large profits and small praises, such as the English bar seems almost infallibly to bestow on diligent abilities. But there is a more elevated prudence which does not stop at affluence in its prospect, but ventures to include the chances of lasting service to mankind, and a good name impressed upon the history of the times."—Vol. i. p. 253.

Mr. Horner's political opinions, throughout his life, were those of the "Old Whigs"—for the "name of dignity" must be granted to Mr. Fox and his followers, in spite of Burke. He died before the question of Parliamentary Reform came to be much agitated, or at least before it was considered as of paramount importance. His opinion, as far as it was made up, seems to have been in opposition to that measure. And one

really cannot deny that there was some merit even in the rottenness of those times, as compared with the purity now in fashion, when we consider that a man like Horner, with no other qualifications than mere ability and public virtue, without mob-eloquence, or the means of bearing the expence of a contested election, and who therefore, had he lived now, would be hopelessly excluded from Parliament, had in the beginning of the present century hardly shown himself in society, or made his talents and integrity known, before the rottenest of boroughs were open for him, without any sort of pledge being required from him as to his future conduct. The first offer of a seat was made to Mr. Horner by Lord Kinnaird in 1806, and after a short hesitation was accepted. He became member for St. Ives in October, but was unseated by the Dissolution of Parliament in the following April. In July he was again elected for Wendover, by the friendship of Lord Carrington. About the same time he was called to the English Bar, and chose the Western Circuit. For the first two or three years of Mr. Horner's Parliamentary life, he took no very active part in the Debates. Timidity and the fear of failure seem to have restrained him from coming prominently forward on any business of importance. His talents were appreciated however even then, and when a change of ministry was in contemplation in 1811, Lord Grenville offered him the place of financial Secretary to the Treasury; accompanying the offer with an assurance, that he himself should feel, and was confident such would be the universal impression, that in the event of Mr. Horner's taking the office, it would be filled by the person in all England the most capable of rendering efficient service to the public in that situation. The offer was declined however by Mr. Horner, tempting as it must have been in the prospects it opened to his ambition, and in the increased facility his position would have afforded him of carrying into execution the views he had already formed, and partially brought before the notice of the House, on the subject of the Currency. He tells his friend Murray, in allusion to Lord Grenville's offer, that he had decided without any difficulty to adhere to the rule which he laid down for himself when he went into Parliament, not to take any political office until he was rich enough to live at ease out of office.

The Currency question was what first brought Mr. Horner into public notice. It is no doubt unnecessary to remind the reader of the anomalous state of the Currency thirty years ago; of the steps by which Bank of England notes, originally as at present convertible at will into gold, came at last to be constituted by Act of Parliament a legal tender; of the excessive issue

which naturally followed the Bank-restriction Act, and the consequent depreciation of paper as compared with gold; or of the unjust operation of this upon all contracts previously made, by raising the price of everything unnaturally, and thus forcibly lowering the value of rents and salaries and the interest due to the public creditors. The injurious operation of the laws then in force is still remembered: and it is strange to think how long they were suffered to continue, and how much ignorance and prejudice prevailed at that time in the House of Commons and in the country. These qualities no doubt were encouraged by some of those whose interests were directly involved in the continuance of such a state of things. Yet one should hardly have thought it possible, even granting that their injustice might have been undetected, for men to have been blind to the absurdity of laws, which rendered a guinea of full weight only worth twenty-one shillings in paper, while a light guinea could readily and legally be sold for twenty-five or twenty-six.

The state of the Currency had attracted Mr. Horner's attention at a very early period. In the year 1800, while he was studying for the Scotch Bar, we find him selecting the subject of the "Circulation of Money" for a paper he had to read at the Speculative Society, a sort of Literary Club at Edinburgh, of which he was a member. He found it however too difficult a theme, and thought what Smith and others had written upon it was too controvertible, to allow him to draw up a paper within so short a time, and therefore chose something else. Two years after, in his 25th year, his attention was again drawn to the subject by Mr. Thornton's work on paper-credit; and his Reviews on that work and on Lord King's pamphlet in the Edinburgh Review will be found to contain the same principles which he afterwards ably enforced in the House of Commons.

It would carry us far beyond our limits were we to attempt here to point out how far Mr. Horner can be considered as having developed the true principles which bear upon the question, beyond the point to which they had been carried by previous writers. The subject, too, has ceased to be practically interesting, and by this time, it is to be hoped, may fairly be looked upon as set at rest.

We may therefore confine our notice to the part which Mr. Horner took in bringing the matter before the public notice. On the 1st of January 1810, he introduced the subject in the House of Commons, by moving for the appointment of a Committee to inquire into the causes of the depreciation of bank notes. The Committee was granted, and Mr. Horner was elected Chairman. Their report, which was delivered in the

ensuing July, recommended the speedy resumption of cash payments by the Bank of England, and the adoption of the general line of conduct, with regard to the currency, which was subsequently acted upon. With the exception of a few points of minor importance, the Report was altogether in conformity with Mr. Horner's original views; indeed it was drawn up in great part by himself. The importance of this step in the right direction can hardly be appreciated as it deserves at the present day, now that the strength of the prejudices to which it was opposed is pretty well forgotten, and juster views upon the subject are prevalent. It seems incredible that the principles they laid down, principles based upon the most elementary truths of Political Economy, should have been questioned; much more that they should have been contradicted and ridiculed. At all events it would have seemed so, had we not witnessed, unhappily, a good deal of the same insensibility to reasoning in these days. The good, however, that was done by the Report is incalculable. It was many years before its suggestions were carried into practice, certainly, but it served to call the attention of the public to the subject, and to place it in a proper light. A host of pamphlets on both sides issued from the press, all commenting, favourably or unfavourably, on the "Bullion Report." The question seems to have attracted a degree of general interest, about that time, such as is seldom accorded to matters of that nature. Nor is this surprising, since it must be recollected that it was one which affected the pecuniary circumstances of almost every individual, as well as the most important interests of the community. And even among Members of Parliament, fortified as persons of that class appear to be against conviction, some converts of influence were made by the Evidence which was circulated with the Report, and the principles laid down in it, and proved by application to the circumstances of the time. Among these was Huskisson, who had supported the Suspension Act of 1797 and all the measures passed, up to 1810, for continuing it in force; and who declared, in the pamphlet he published in the Autumn of that year, that he had been convinced of his error by the evidence produced before the Bullion Committee, of which he had been a member.

In August 1811 Mr. Horner proposed a series of resolutions in accordance with the Report, in a speech which as far as we have the means of judging must have exhibited singular ability. He was complimented upon it by Malthus, who expressed his wonder how Mr. Horner could have contrived to treat a subject, necessarily involving so many dry details, in a manner which so

completely commanded the attention of his hearers. He was opposed however by ministers, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Vansittart, having moved counter-resolutions, Mr. Horner was defeated by a large majority. The debate was followed by Lord King's celebrated notice to his tenants, and the legislative measures which it led to. Mr. Horner seems to have been prevented from ill health from taking part in these debates, and next year, before anything further had been done in the matter, Parliament was dissolved. Mr. Horner lost his seat for Wendover, Lord Carrington having to provide for a nephew who had come of age since the last election. In one of his letters about this time, Mr. Horner speaks of his mortification at being thrown out of the course, and his regret at no longer having the opportunity of endeavouring to be useful to the public, and expresses himself as being sorry and ashamed to have done so little during the time he had such opportunity. Subsequently, however, a seat was offered him by Lord Grenville: but the offer served only as an occasion to evince his magnanimity. Sir Samuel Romilly had just lost his election at Bristol; and Mr. Horner, having ascertained that he would not refuse coming into Parliament for a close borough if the offer were made him, wrote to Lord Holland, through whom the offer had been made, desiring him to express his gratitude to Lord Grenville; "but," said he, "I wish you to consider, in the first instance, claims that are far before mine. When the Bristol contest was over, I wrote to Romilly, under an idea that he might object to come in for a rotten borough, urging him as strongly as I could not to suffer a feeling of that nature to stand in the way of his duty to the public, if he should have such a seat offered him. I have heard from him this morning, and I am happy to find he is not disposed to decline it. He says, 'I certainly have not made up my mind to refuse coming into Parliament in the way you mention. My opinion upon that subject is greatly altered since it has become the only legal way in which to me Parliament can be accessible. There will be time enough, however, for me to consider what I should do, if any offer were made me.' It seems to me so very important on every public ground, and for the true interests of the Whig party, that Romilly should be brought in, that I thought it right to put you in possession of his sentiments." An opportunity of sitting in Parliament was eventually afforded to Romilly by the Burgesses of Arundel, who, to use an expression of Gibbon's, were generally of the same opinion with the Duke of Norfolk. But from some cause unexplained in these volumes, the offered seat was not bestowed on Mr. Horner. In the fol-

lowing March, however, a seat fell vacant, which the interest of Mr. Fremantle obtained for him, without stipulation or pledge of any sort, except to resign whenever his politics should differ from those of the person who had the means of recommending him to the seat; and accordingly Mr. Horner again entered the House, as Member for St. Mawes. One of the first votes he gave was in opposition to a resolution proposed by Sir Henry Parnell, to allow the importation of corn under a graduated scale of duties, and in favour of continuing the corn laws in the state they were left in at the end of the war, when the corn trade was in fact perfectly free. Mr. Horner was a steady and consistent supporter of the principle of free trade, in corn and everything else, and at a later period of his life, when he was in Italy, we find him lamenting over the spectacle of cargoes of wheat going to supply the wants of every country in Europe, except England.

Mr. Horner seems to have exerted himself more after his re-election, and there are notices of several of his speeches on different occasions. He appears to have been received very favourably in the House, and Sir James Mackintosh is reported to have said, in allusion to his speeches upon the corn question and that of Genoa, that two such speeches had never been made in the House of Commons by the same person in one week, or at least not for a great many years.

Bonaparte's return from Elba gave rise to a difference of opinion among the Whigs, as to the policy to be pursued with relation to France, and Mr. Horner voted in a small minority against declaring war. This vote was in opposition to the opinions of Lord Buckingham, to whom he owed his seat, and he accordingly wrote to that nobleman offering to resign it. His Lordship, replied in very handsome terms, assuring him that at present he saw no reason to accept his resignation. It is not necessary, to enable us to appreciate the manliness with which Mr. Horner adhered to his convictions when almost alone, and amidst the warlike ferment which pervaded the country, and in opposition to almost all his friends, that we should agree with him as to the justice of those convictions. Nor is this the place to discuss the question, whether our declaration of war at that time, and our invasion of France for the purpose of reinstating the Bourbons, were just or politic. Mr. Horner adhered throughout to his unfavourable opinion of our conduct in that supplementary war, and his sympathies were with the French, as soon as it came to be a question of invading their territory. The grounds on which his opinions were formed appear in his letters:—

"A war renewed now upon the footing of the Treaty of Paris will be in truth a war for the restoration of the Bourbon family, coupled with a still more indefensible principle, that of proscribing an individual to destruction. No successes would ever reconcile me to such a war; but by so recommencing it we should multiply all the chances against us. The entrance of foreign troops upon French territory will give the Emperor, at once, all the strength of French national enthusiasm, certainly not weakened by having been suppressed for a year, nor by the insults which it has recently submitted to. If the Austrians march across the Rhine, I suppose they will detain the Empress and the young boy, as hostages; and that cannot fail to give Bonaparte an advantage in the war, both among his own people and foreigners, of all the interest and sympathy which such a circumstance must naturally inspire: and all this is to be done, with the hope of forcing upon France a family who, in a year's possession of the throne, could not secure a dozen bayonets to keep them in it, and who were so utterly insignificant, that they were not molested in their flight."

"I never felt any interest in wars, either reading of them, or looking on in our own days, except on the side of the invaded; and whether they be Greeks or Persians, Russians or French, my wishes have always been in favour of each in their turn, for the success of their defence. Conceive me to hate Bonaparte as you do, but yet to wish, as I do fervently, for a successful resistance by France to the invasion of the Allies, and you are pretty nearly in possession of all my present politics. Could I make the future to my mind, *sponte mea componere curas*, I would balance the success of the war upon the frontiers of old France very evenly, and would keep up the struggle for power at Paris between Napoleon and the Constitutional party."—Vol. ii. p. 273.

Waterloo, however, "made the future" not at all to Mr. Horner's mind. The occupation of the capital by foreign troops filled him with something of a Frenchman's indignation, and he exclaimed against the ungenerous policy of sending Napoleon to St. Helena.

"It was a very painful circumstance in my last visit to Scotland, from the little politics I talked with anybody, to find myself so far asunder from my best friends in our views of foreign affairs. To me, it is losing the chief relish of life not to feel alike with them upon things which make us all feel strongly. And I have laid nothing so much to heart for many years as the difference which I imagine exists among us, respecting the nature and character of the present crisis of European politics. All the opinions which I have ever cherished seem, on this occasion, concentrated, and all the principles which have been gaining strength and confirmation in my mind every year of my life, seem put in peril at once. It is a question, whether all the good fruits of the French Revolution, dearly and cruelly as they have been earned, are to be lost to France: and whether it is not to be settled in the instance of that country, that the greatest and most civilized people may, by the

confederacy of courts and the alliance of armies, be subjected to the government of a family whom they despise and detest. It is a question whether the very first principle of slavery, that the people are the property of certain royal families, is not to be established as a fundamental maxim in the system of Europe; and whether the vital principle of our English liberty and our Revolution is not to be antiquated as a Jacobinical heresy by the force of English arms. The degradation of our army in being the main instrument of this warfare against freedom and civilization, the stain upon the national name in making so ungenerous a use of our triumph over our rival in arms, our keeping the *Police* of Paris to protect the Bourbons, while they are murdering with judicial forms those who tried the fortune of war with us, and to whom we in words, and they by fact and deed, gave warrant of an amnesty; these are incidental subjects of grief and shame, which embitter the pain with which one contemplates the course of events, and which will leave wounds upon our honour, even if the future struggle should take a favourable turn; but the struggle to which I look is that of the French people against the Bourbons and against the Confederate Sovereigns. And the most anxious and the most depressing reflection that perpetually recurs upon me, is the conviction, that for the success of this great contest, the principles of liberty must rely for their principal support upon the enlightened men of England, while most of these are not yet awakened to a sense of what is doing, and of what the consequences will inevitably be."

"I fancy you will not agree with me," he says to Mr. Hallam, "in being sorry to see, that nothing has been said by anybody, upon the bills relating to the prisoner at St. Helena, expressive of a regret that it was cast upon this country to execute so odious a part of the arrangements to which the victory of Waterloo has led. You know all my sentiments about the man, how little I share any of the admiration which his extraordinary fortunes and character have imposed upon some persons, and how much I execrated all along his tyranny and military ambition, and enmity to all civil liberty. At the height of his power I expressed myself more strongly against him than I should permit myself to do publicly now. In the treatment he has met with, I feel no inclination to deny, that the sparing his life is an act of humanity, such as is not recorded of any of those former ages in which such characters and events are to be found; yet I cannot but feel at the same time that when a few years more are gone by, and we can all look back upon these transactions from some distance, it will be our regret and mortification that the Government of this day could see no safety for Europe against a single man, but in transporting him to a rock in the Ocean, and that in leaving him his life, we have taken all that can make life anything but a torment. I do not mean to make any stronger imputation, than that we have been wanting in magnanimity, where the opportunity was obvious and commanding. But this country has reached too high a station to be at liberty to miss such opportunities. Our virtues must rise with our fortune, or we shall be thought to have been unworthy of it. A large and secure generosity is one of the conditions by which we

are to hold our greatness. Instead of this we have treated our captive with the timid severity of a little republic; and have lowered ourselves to the notions of our despot allies, who know nothing of safety but in force and bonds."—Vol. ii. p. 316.

These extracts may serve to give some notion of the style of Mr. Horner's parliamentary speaking, which unquestionably derived much of its effect from its suitableness to the known character of the man. It had nothing affected in it. And from the unimaginative tendency of his mind, and his want of wit, it may readily be inferred that his oratory would be of an argumentative cast. In fact strength of reasoning, and that perspicuity which arises from a thorough comprehension of his subject, are what form the chief merits of all his compositions. His speeches have, besides, an unusual degree of vigour and force, produced evidently by the earnestness with which he strove to impress his own convictions upon his hearers. He laboured indefatigably from a very early age in improving his style, and bestowed, perhaps, more attention upon it than one is apt to suppose an accomplishment of that sort deserves. His speech in the debate of the 20th Feb. 1816, on the Treaties of Peace, is better reported than ordinary: and enough of it is given to account, in some measure, for the great effect it is said to have produced in the House, and for the praises which were bestowed on it. It is a forcible denunciation of the Ministry, for having deluded this Country as well as France by false pretences; having declared when they entered on the campaign that their purpose was not to interfere with the internal government of France; and by that means having not only obtained several votes in the House, which they would not have had, if it had been understood from the first that their object was to replace the Bourbons, but also having neutralized many Frenchmen who would otherwise have joined the banner of Napoleon.

Just before the delivery of this Speech, Mr. Horner had brought before the House a Bill to regulate the proceedings of Grand Juries in Ireland. An illegal practice, it seems, had long prevailed in that country, of finding Bills of Indictment upon the mere productions of the depositions before the magistrates, without examining any of the witnesses. So far back as 1762, when Mr. Justice Aston, who had recently gone over to Ireland from Westminster Hall, told the Judges there that their practice in this respect was a direct violation of the law, they solemnly decided that it was very good law for Ireland. The magistrates who had taken the depositions were themselves, in that

ill-governed country, influenced by party spirit and other such motives to such an extent, that when one magistrate committed, his neighbour would often interfere to bail, and it was common for cross-informations to be sworn, that the delinquent and the party aggrieved might be placed on an equal footing, both being sent to stand their trial. It may readily be conceived what confusion and injustice must have been the consequence, and how mere a nullity the finding of the Grand Jury, from depositions alone, must have become. Mr. Horner introduced a Declaratory Act to remedy this abuse, which was passed the same Session, though not without much opposition on the part of the Irish Judges, who felt it as casting a reflection on their previous conduct. Those very Judges, we are told, in a few years after the reform was carried into operation, concurred with all the other parties whom it affected, in approbation of it; and the introduction of it must be looked upon as one of the most valuable of Mr. Horner's services in Parliament.

These were among the last acts of his political life. On the first of May following he made another attempt to prevail on the House to do something towards correcting the evils arising from the state of the currency, by moving for the appointment of a Select Committee "to enquire into the expediency of restoring the cash payments of the Bank of England, and the safest and most advantageous mode of effecting it." The motion was negatived by a large majority. Mr. Horner's speeches on this occasion are remarkable, both as pointing out the exact course which was pursued three years afterwards, and as bringing forward the argument which was then used by Sir Robert Peel in support of it; the approximation, namely, in the value of bullion and of notes, which had recently taken place in consequence of a peculiar juncture of circumstances.

Mr. Horner's last speech in the House of Commons was on the subject of Catholic Emancipation. His health had never been very vigorous, and, this summer, symptoms of a disease in the chest began to make their appearance. He was ordered to abstain from public speaking and every kind of exertion, and in the autumn his medical advisers recommended him to go abroad, as his only chance of recovery. His brother Leonard accompanied him through France into Italy, and Pisa was selected for their winter quarters. His mind remained as clear as ever, and he occupied himself in reading Machiavel and Dante, and in forming a plan of his studies and intellectual exercises for the future. The disease, however, was not to be baffled, and on the 8th of February 1817 he expired. On examining the body it was found that his complaint was not consumption,

as had been supposed, but an enlargement of the air-cells and condensation of the substance of the lungs.

The death, at so early an age, of a man so well qualified in every way to play a distinguished part in public life, so able and willing to have done good service to his country, and of a disposition so adapted to conciliate friendship and disarm enmity, caused, as it may be supposed, a very general and deep sorrow. At the suggestion of the Speaker the unusual course was adopted, in moving for a new writ to the Borough of St. Mawes, vacated by Mr. Horner's death, of giving an expression in the House of Commons, to the feelings of regret that pervaded men of all parties. His opponents did justice to his memory, and he was eulogized at once by Canning and Romilly: the former forgetting for the time Mr. Horner's steady opposition to the principles he had himself espoused, the latter recognizing a character that in many of its features was akin to his own. Horner, like Romilly, united in a very unusual degree modesty and decision of character—a rare combination; yet when the principles are considered upon which these qualities in both of them were based, it is apparent that they are perfectly compatible with each other. Their decisiveness arose from a strong sense of duty, which was paramount to all other considerations; and, therefore, kept them steadily along a straightforward path, away from which no force from within or from without ever had the power to drive them. Both of them carried a chivalrous sense of honour into a place, where honour that would have stood almost every other test has too often been debased: and both brought it out again unsullied. In domestic life both were warmhearted, simple, and affectionate; their superior talents and the eminence these gained for them never inspired either of them with any feeling of pride, nor did the excitements of ambition dull their sympathies in the every-day concerns of their friends.

"I never saw any person," says Mr. Sydney Smith, "who took such a lively interest in the daily happiness of his friends. If you were unwell, if there was a sick child in the nursery, if any death happened in your family, he never forgot you for an instant! You always found there was a man with a good heart who was never far from you."

We cannot conclude these notices of Mr. Horner better than in the words of Sir James Mackintosh, one of his most intimate friends in early life.

"The short life of this excellent person is worthy of serious contemplation, by those more especially who, in circumstances like his, enter

upon the slippery paths of public affairs. Without the aids of birth or fortune, in an assembly where aristocratical propensities prevail,—by his understanding, industry, pure taste, and useful information,—still more by modest independence, by steadiness and sincerity, joined to moderation,—by the stamp of unbending integrity, and by the conscientious considerateness which breathed throughout his well-chosen language,—he raised himself, at the early age of thirty-six, to a moral *authority* which, without these qualities, no brilliancy of talents or power of reasoning could have acquired. No eminent speaker in Parliament owed so much of his success to his moral *character*. His high place was, therefore, honourable to his audience and to his country. Regret for his death was expressed with touching unanimity from every part of a divided assembly, unused to manifestations of sensibility, abhorrent from theatrical display, and whose tributes, on such an occasion, derived its peculiar value from their general coldness and sluggishness. The tears of those to whom he was unknown were shed over him; and at the head of those by whom he was, 'praised, wept and honoured,' was one, whose commendation would have been more enhanced in the eye of Mr. Horner, by his discernment and veracity, than by the signal proof of the concurrence of all orders, as well as parties, which was afforded by the name of Howard."—Vol. ii. p. 430.

L.

ART. III.—ENDEAVOURS AFTER THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. A Volume of Discourses. By JAMES MARTINEAU. London: Green. 1843.

WHEN the late Edward Irving, some years ago, published a volume of his singular addresses from the pulpit, he refused to call them Sermons, lest he should deter the general public from their perusal, by the presumption of dullness supposed to attach to all compositions which bear this ominous title. We suspect he was not far wrong in his estimate of the feeling which pervades a very large portion of society. With the exception of the class that is peculiarly designated the religious, and whose interest may be considered as artificially sustained by the existing institutions of religion—all the rest of mankind appear to cast aside with great indifference the multitude of sermons that annually issue from the press—as altogether barren of solid instruction, smitten throughout by the blight of common-place, and setting forth with unnecessary pomp of elaboration in soul-less and conventional phrase, either propositions which nobody disputes or doctrines with which no clear and hearty conviction is associated. Not a few, therefore, are inclined to believe, that this kind of literature, though upheld for a time by the force of established institutions, has accomplished its function in the moral discipline of the world, and is verging with the present tendencies of society to its final extinction.

In this persuasion we do not ourselves participate. Productions from time to time appear (and the volume before us is among the number) which convince us, that it is unfounded, and suggested rather by the confined views of a transient position of human affairs than by a wide survey of the permanent necessities of mankind. The whole experience of the past and the most decided indications of the future forbid the expectation, that men will ever entirely renounce the inspiring exercises of public worship, and will not avail themselves at such seasons of the faithful admonitions of some friend and brother, who makes the duties and destination of humanity and its mysterious connexions with the infinite and eternal—the theme of his habitual contemplations. The feelings which grow out of our moral relations, and the deep questionings they excite in every thoughtful mind—are not like many of the elements of our outward life—our material civilization; they do not appertain to a particular condition of society, and pass away with it,—

but, though the forms and expressions of them may vary from age to age, are instinct with perpetual youth and possess an imperishable interest. No advances in science can possibly exhaust the insatiable demands of the soul on that vast world which must ever lie behind the impressions of sense. At the loftiest heights of attainable knowledge, the soul will sustain an unaltered relation to the unsearchable God and the boundless universe. Life and death and the unfathomable wonders which encompass them—the upbraidings of conscience, the sense of frailty, the anguish of bereavement, and the fond presages of a purer and happier futurity—will still visit the heart with their sad and solemn influence, and awaken the reflections of the contemplative, and call on the more gifted to interpret their mysteries.

In the necessary existence of such feelings we find a reason for the perpetuity of worship, of spiritual consolation, of religious warning and admonition; we discern in them the springs of a perennial devotion—the everlasting poetry of the human heart. Here is the sphere of the highest order of genius. Hence flow the elements of that lofty influence which is wielded by the prophet and the bard. Their subject is humanity—its doubts, its fears, its struggles, its aspirations; and the instrument with which they act upon it, is the utterance of a melodious heart breathing in harmony with the sweet and silent music that fills the spiritual universe. The themes on which the humblest preacher dwells, are closely allied to those on which the most inspired have given forth their deepest thoughts. In their most thrilling passages, Dante, Shakspeare, Milton, Wordsworth—touch those very chords of human sympathy which are appealed to—though often without response—in every discourse from the pulpit.

It is clear, therefore, there can be nothing in the nature of the subjects properly embraced by a sermon that should deprive it of the greatest power over the human mind, or exclude from it the highest efforts of genius. On the contrary, the very fact, that it is spoken—in the presence of numbers and under the exciting influences of sympathy—and designed for immediate effect on the heart and life—would seem to render it a fitter vehicle of genuine inspiration than such works as aim at producing kindred impressions on the solitary reader through the remoter influences and more circuitous associations of fiction. And it is probable that no action of mind on mind has ever equalled in depth, directness and extent of influence, the preaching, in troubled and exciting periods, of ardent natures, roused by a great object and determined to attain it. That the calmer and nobler forms of

pulpit eloquence do not more frequently appear, we impute mainly to the constitution of most Christian churches—whether established or nonconformist—which deters the best order of minds from engaging in their service, and embarrasses even the few they occasionally secure, with discouragements and restrictions that impede the finest exercise of genius. We allude not merely to the incessant demand for periodical efforts of the same kind, which induces a certain flatness and mechanical uniformity of execution, and to that imperfect division of labour, arising from the multiplicity of sects, which exacts too much from one individual, and prevents the completest unfolding of the specific gifts of different minds in the various offices of pastoral administration, religious instruction, moral warning and spiritual excitement—but chiefly to that denial of free thought, fearless utterance and independent action, which too frequently makes the preacher merely the mouth-piece of the people—the recognized organ—through which voice and apparent vitality are given to doctrines deposited in their public confessions, or cherished in their hereditary prejudices. True eloquence is the outpouring of hearty conviction—the expression of a soul penerated to its inmost core with the spirit of humanity, and the love of truth and right. Were religious teachers released from the bondage under which the Church is now languishing, and their hearts brought into immediate contact with God, and Christ, and human kind—conviction and sympathy would come back again, and unseal once more the hidden fountains of inspiration, and shed a quickening influence on the arid unproductive fields of religious formalism; and the lowliest preachers of the Gospel, labouring in the spirit of truthfulness and fidelity, would feel their vocation ennobled by the consciousness, that it was not deemed unworthy of the most intense interest and the highest efforts of the greatest minds.

As it is—wherever, by a happy coincidence of circumstances, faith and professional obligation have been in harmony—what precious fruits of wisdom and eloquence have often been produced by a noble mind's dedication of itself to the service of religion! In the whole compass of our literature, where shall we find a more solemn and dignified eloquence than in Hooker—richer overflowings of spiritual tenderness and beauty than in Taylor—or a more exhausting analysis of the deepest religious themes than in Barrow? Nor must we go back two centuries for proofs of the vast capabilities of pulpit eloquence. Numbers are yet living who can bear witness to the thrilling effect produced on hearers of every description, by the spontaneous—and as if inspired—effusions of Robert Hall—of

which the colder and more elaborate records transmitted through the press, are said to convey hardly the faintest idea. And what writer of the present day has exerted the same moral influence as Channing, whose sermons on the familiar themes of God, and heaven and duty—without the recommendation of novel speculation or recondite learning, and in spite of the prejudices against an obnoxious creed—have carried with them the love and sympathy of human hearts, wherever the English language is read, by the simple earnestness and comprehensive benevolence of their spirit? With such facts before us, we cannot believe, it is from dearth of materials, or from the enfeebling of moral sympathies and religious tendencies, that the pulpit seems to be losing its influence—but rather from the want of earnestness and conviction in numbers who occupy it—from the absence of simplicity of purpose and courageous reliance on truth.

We have little doubt, that the excellent and highly gifted author of the Discourses mentioned at the head of this article, will take his place among those who have redeemed sermon writing from the charge of being necessarily deficient in interest and instruction. His volume is the production of a vigorous, richly-stored and earnest mind, and marked by one of the surest indications of genius—the power of placing familiar truths in a new light, and of strengthening and adorning, by original illustration, conceptions which have become almost powerless from the monotonous garb in which they are usually clothed. As a preacher, speaking with manly seriousness to the conscience of his fellow-beings, Mr. Martineau was precluded by the nature of his subject, from throwing out any views of religion and morals that are absolutely new; but he has quickened into fresh life old and faded themes, and dispelled the dull and heavy conventionalism that hung around them:—and this first of all excellencies in a spiritual instructor, he appears to us to derive not more from the strength of his intellect and the vivacity of his imagination, than from the general intrepidity of his mental constitution which disposes him to apprehend every object in a manner peculiar to himself, and that calm internal depth of faith which is never disturbed by the boldest sweeps of his speculation.

We shall attempt to describe simply and faithfully—if possible, without any consideration of our personal feelings towards the author—the impression which his volume has left upon our mind, substantiating our judgments by a few extracts from its pages.—The whole work is distinguished by a philosophical breadth and elevation of view, which surveys the commonest duties of life and the simplest offices of religion under a very different aspect from that which they wear to the

ordinary observer, traces their relations with the general economy of providence, and raises them into dignity by unfolding their affinity with the noblest attributes of an immortal mind. A pure and lofty morality, almost severe in its construction of human obligations—high faith in God and the unchangeable rectitude of his moral government, and a benevolence healthful and comprehensive, and wholly uninfected with sentimentality —breathe in every line, and inspire the fullest confidence in the character and purposes of the writer. Whatever may be thought of the soundness of all his opinions, no one can fail to perceive, that he is thoroughly in earnest;—that God and Christianity and human duty and the heavenly world are with him something more than phrases—that they are constantly before his mind as realities, of whose existence he is firmly persuaded, and to which he is prepared to surrender all the energies of his being. In his view, religion is not a means, but an end —the highest, the only, end of man; and every plan of life which comes short of it, wants the basis of solid wisdom and virtue.

These moral qualities which must alone give interest to every work that clearly reflects them, are recommended by intellectual endowments of a high order, by an acute and penetrating judgment which seizes at once the essential points of an argument, and by a philosophical fancy of no ordinary richness which fetches its illustrations, often with great felicity, from an ample range of scientific and literary attainment. The author's style—singularly expressive of the character of his mind—is always luminous, never dull, and in his best passages pure, vigorous and graceful.

Criticism of the separate discourses would extend this notice to too great a length; and different readers, according to the constitution of their minds, will probably be attracted by different excellencies: but we cannot refrain from directing attention more particularly to the third, 'Great Principles and Small Duties'—the seventh, 'Religion on False Pretences'—the eighth, on 'Mammon Worship'—the two (ninth and tenth) on 'The Kingdom of God within us'—the fifteenth, 'The Strength of the Lonely'—the nineteenth, 'The Great Year of Providence' —and the last in the volume, 'Nothing Human ever dies'—as peculiarly distinguished by justness of reasoning, delicacy of discrimination, originality of conception, and happiness of illustration. It is really difficult to select amidst so much that is wise and beautiful. The following passage from the third discourse exhibits in the most favourable light Mr. Martineau's fine sense and delicate delineation of moral beauty:—

"It is an error to suppose that homely minds are the best administrators of small duties. Who does not know how wretched a contradiction such a rule receives in the moral economy of many a home?—how often the daily troubles, the swarm of blessed cares, the innumerable minutiæ of arrangement in a family, prove quite too much for the generalship of feeble minds, and even the clever selfishness of strong ones; how a petty and scrupulous anxiety, in defending with infinite perseverance, some small and almost invisible point of frugality and comfort, surrenders the greater unobserved, and while saving money ruins minds; how, on the other hand, a rough and unmellowed sagacity *rules* indeed and without defeat, but while maintaining in action the mechanism of government, creates a constant and intolerable friction, a grating together of reluctant wills, a groaning under the consciousness of force, that make the movements of life fret and chafe incessantly? But where, in the presiding genius of a home, taste and sympathy unite (and in their genuine forms they cannot be separated)—the intelligent feeling for moral beauty and the deep heart of domestic love,—with what ease, what mastery, what graceful disposition, do the seeming trivialities of existence fall into order, and drop a blessing as they take their place! how do the hours steal away, unnoticed but by the precious fruits they leave! and by the self-renunciations of affection, there comes a spontaneous adjustment of various wills; and not an innocent pleasure is lost, nor a pure taste offended, nor a peculiar temper unconsidered; and every day has its silent achievements of wisdom, and every night its retrospect of piety and love; and the tranquil thoughts that, in the evening meditation, come down with the starlight, seem like the serenade of angels, bringing in melody the peace of God! Wherever this picture is realized, it is not by microscopic solicitude of spirit, but by comprehension of mind, and enlargement of heart; by that breadth and nicety of moral view which discerns every thing in due proportion, and in avoiding an intense elaboration of trifles, has energy to spare for what is great; in short, by a perception akin to that of God, whose providing frugality is on an infinite scale, vigilant alike in heaven and on earth; whose art colours a universe with beauty, and touches with its pencil the petals of a flower. A soul thus pure and large disowns the paltry rules of dignity, the silly notions of great and mean, by which fashion distorts God's real proportions; is utterly delivered from the spirit of contempt; and in consulting for the benign administration of life, will learn many a task, and discharge many an office, from which lesser beings, esteeming themselves greater, would shrink as ignoble. But in truth, nothing is degrading which a high and graceful purpose ennobles; and offices the most menial cease to be menial, the moment they are wrought in love. What thousand services are rendered, aye, and by delicate hands, around the bed of sickness, which, else considered mean, become at once holy and quite inalienable rights. To smooth the pillow, to proffer the draught, to soothe or to obey the fancies of the delirious will, to sit for hours as the mere sentinel of the feverish sleep;—these things are suddenly erected, by their relation to hope and life, into sacred pri-

vileges. And experience is perpetually bringing occasions, similar in kind though of less persuasive poignancy, when a true eye and a lovely heart will quickly see the relations of things thrown into a new position, and calling for a sacrifice of conventional order to the higher laws of the affections; and alike without condescension and without ostentation, will noiselessly take the post of gentle service and do the kindly deed. Thus is it that the lesser graces display themselves most richly, like the leaves and flowers of life, where there is the deepest and the widest root of love; not like the staring and artificial blossoms of dry custom that, winter or summer, cannot change; but living petals woven in nature's workshop and folded by her tender skill, opening and shutting morning and night, glancing and trembling in the sunshine and the breeze. This easy capacity of great affections for small duties is the peculiar triumph of the highest spirit of love."—p. 38-41.

There is a profound wisdom beautifully expressed in the concluding passage of the discourse, entitled—we must add, with with some want of good taste—"The Besetting God:"—

"It is not apparently the design of Heaven that we should be permitted to seek rest and to desire ease in this aspiring state; and it is the vain attempt to make compromise between duty and indulgence, that creates the corrosions of conscience, and the perpetual disquietudes of spirit, and disappoints our own ideal from day to day and from year to year. There is no way to the peace of God but by absolute self-abandonment to his will that whispers within us, without reservation of happiness or self. Then, the relinquishment once made,—giving ourselves up to any high faith within the heart,—the sorrows of mortality, its reproaches, its fears, will soon vanish, and even death be robbed of its terrors; for, to quote the noble words of Lord Bacon, 'He that dies in an earnest pursuit is like one that is wounded in hot blood, who for the time scarce feels the hurt; and therefore a mind fixed and bent upon somewhat that is good, doth best avert the dolours of death.'"—p. 31.

How deep an insight into character is displayed in the following portraiture, where many a mind will recognize features that it has known in its living experience!

"He who is dependent on human sympathy acquires far greater power over others. He reflects and reciprocates the emotions of other minds; he understands their prejudices; he is no stranger to their weaknesses; he does not stare at their impulses, like a being too sublime to comprehend them. He may not obtain that kind of distant respect which is yielded to the man of cold but acute and confident intellect;—a respect which is founded in fear,—which suppresses opposition without winning trust,—which silences objectors without relieving their objections;—that unsatisfactory respect which we feel when conscious that another is right, without perceiving *where* it is that we are wrong. But he may earn that better power, which arises from profound and affectionate know-

ledge of the human heart. There is no human being to whom we look with so true a faith, as to him who shows himself deep read in the mysteries within us, who seems to have dwelt where Omniscience only had access, and traced momentary lines of feeling whose rapid flash our own eye could scarcely follow; who put into words weaknesses which we had hardly dared to confess in thought; who appears to have trembled with our own anxieties, and wept our very tears. This initiation into the interior nature is the quality which, above all others, gives one mind power over another. If it comes upon us from the living tones of a friendly voice, we listen as to the breathings of inspiration; if it act on us only from the pages of a book, the enchantment is hardly less potent. That a being, distant and unknown, perhaps departed, should have so penetrated our subtlest emotions, and caught our most transient attitudes of thought, should have so detected our sophistries of conscience, and witnessed the miseries of our temptations, and known the sacredness of our affections, that we appear revealed anew even to ourselves, truly seems the greatest of the triumphs of genius. It is a triumph peculiar to those who love the sympathies of their kind, and, because they love them, instinctively appreciate and understand them. It is essentially the triumph which Christ won when the minions of tyranny and hypocrisy shrunk back from him in awe, saying, 'Never man spake like this man.'

"With this quality, however, great feebleness of will, and even total prostration of moral power, may sometimes be found combined; and we may almost say, the greater the intellectual endowments, the more likely is this to be the case. If ordinary minds want sympathy before they can act freely, they can easily obtain it; their ideas and feelings are of the common staple of humanity, and some one who has them too may be found across the street. But if those of finer mould should have the same dependence of heart, it may prove a sore affliction and temptation to them; for who will respond to the desires, and aims, and emotions most dear to them? They wed themselves to a benevolent scheme;—it is thrust aside as a chimera. They demonstrate a truth of startling magnitude;—it is ackowledged and passed by. They describe some misery of the poor, the child, or the guilty;—the world weeps, and the oppression is untouched. They pour forth their conceptions of perfect character, and seek to refresh in men's minds the bewildered sentiment of right;—every conscience approves, and not a volition stirs. And thus they are left alone, without the practical support of a single sympathy: what wonder that they think in one way, and act in another, when the world reverences their thoughts, and ridicules their actions? Compelled by their nature to desire, what they are forbidden by men to execute; unable to love anything but that which is pronounced to be fit only for a dream; secretly dwelling within a beauty of excellence which they would be held insane to realize,—what wonder is it, if their practical energies die of dearth,—if they begin to doubt their nobler nature, and, while cherishing it in private, dishonour it in the world,—if the pure sincerity of their mind is thus at length broken down, and they soil in act the spirit which they sanctify in thought; and life wastes away in habits, on which the meditations of privacy pour a flood of ineffectual shame, and

in impulses to better things, more and more passionate, as the springs of the will become broken, and prayers for peace of more mournful earnestness, as the vision sinks into melancholy distance?"—p. 222-6.

The following idea, though not absolutely new, we have never before met with, so clearly conceived, or so briefly and forcibly expressed :—

"The Reformation can never be properly understood, so long as it is looked at either in the light of a change of doctrines, or a publication of the right of the intellect to free inquiry. It was, essentially, a substitution of individual faith for sacerdotal reliance, of personal religion for ecclesiastical obedience. The same spirit, in a less healthy form, re-appeared, to reproduce the same phenomena, when Methodism arose, and diffused itself with gradual, but triumphant power from the earnest souls of the Wesleys. In all these instances, the regenerative influence commences its action with the great mass of the people: for it is an apparent law of Providence, that while in society *knowledge descends, faiths ascend*: while science, doubt, opinion, all ideas of the understanding, gravitate from the few to the many; affections, convictions, truths of the conscience and the heart, rise from the many to the few."—p. 151.

To the feelings which dictated this vindication of social worship our hearts yield an entire response, and we rejoice to have an advocate like Mr. Martineau for the preservation of sanctities, which we think with him it is no proof of enlightenment to despise.

"It is universally felt that devotion must sometimes quit the solitude of the cell, forget its mere individual wants, and speak as from humanity's great heart to God. The scruples of the few who have objected to social piety have met with no response; they are justly regarded as the eccentricities of a stiff and petty rationalism, that will not stir without a literal precept, and trusts any logical finger-post (possibly set the wrong way by the humour of some sophistry), rather than the cardinal guidance of those high affections which are in truth the imperishable lights of heaven. To this house we come, my friends, drawn, not by arbitrary command which we fear to disobey; not by self-interest, temporal or spiritual, which we deem it prudent to consult; not, I trust, from dead conventionalism, that brings the body and leaves the soul; but by a common quest of some holy spirit to penetrate and purify our life; by a common desire to quit its hot and level dust, and from its upland slopes of contemplation inhale the serenity of God; by the secret sadness of sin, that can delay its confessions and bear its earthliness no more; by the deep though dim consciousness, that the passing weeks do not leave us where they find us, but plant us within nearer distance, and give us a more intimate view, of that fathomless eternity, wherein so many dear and mortal things have dropped from our imploring eyes. It is no wonder that in meditations solemn as these we love and seek

each other's sympathy. It is easy, no doubt, to journey alone in the broad sunshine and on the beaten highways of our lot; but over the midnight plain, and beneath the still immensity of darkness, the traveller seeks some fellowship for his wanderings. And what is religion, but the midnight hemisphere of life, whose vault is filled with the silence of God, and whose everlasting stars, if giving no clear light, yet fill the soul with dreams of immeasurable glory? It will be an awful thing to each of us to be alone, when he takes the passage from the mortal to the immortal, and is borne along,—with unknown time for expectant thought,—through the space that severs earth from heaven: and till then, at least, we will not part, but speak with the common voice of supplicating trust of that which awaits us all."—pp. 191-193.

We could quote much more with pleasure, but we must forbear. What we have already extracted will, we think, sufficiently bear out the opinion we have expressed of the genius and pure feeling which pervade the volume.—We should not, however, satisfy our own sense of the duties of an honest criticism, if we failed to notice some peculiarities of style, and an occasional exaggeration of view, which mar here and there the general effect of such high excellence. One remark occurs to us, at the outset, on Mr. Martineau's style of composition,—that it is too uniformly high-coloured and brilliant; the mental eye seeks more relief and shade, and misses that subdued and quiet tone which seems to us most in harmony with the solemnity and pathos of religious teaching. He is too fond of putting his statements in a startling shape, and sometimes employs expressions which offend by their strangeness. Occasionally his similitudes have a sharpness and precision of outline which cause them to stand out too prominently from the general ground of the passage, and are wrought out into a fulness which goes beyond the purpose of legitimate illustration, and implies a momentary ascendancy of the imagination over the affections. His imagination, indeed—as is usual with the higher forms of mind—exists in intimate union with the reasoning faculty, and takes part in all its operations; but the predominance of the imagination is not unfrequently too marked, and requires the restraints of a severer taste. He constantly transforms the abstract into the picturesque, and dissipates by the very distinctness of his visible images that dim twilight of the interior soul in which the vast conceptions of the Infinite and Eternal love to dwell. The most splendid and elaborate passages of Mr. Martineau's volume are not, therefore, those which we most admire. We read him with the most unmingled satisfaction and delight, where the activity of his imagination is kept down by his deep moral earnestness, or by the vigour of his intellect in

encountering some specious sophistry, and where his style, still retaining its characteristic force and clearness, is clothed only with that general brightness of hue which betrays the exuberant fertility of the suggesting mind.

The following passages will furnish, we conceive, a justification of the foregoing criticism. In p. 25, where our planet is compared to an eye, and the conscience of humanity to its retina, the figure is wrought out with a hardness and precision that repel sympathy; and earlier in the same discourse (p. 23), the important truth of the Divine personality is developed with a boldness which, to our taste, is painfully anthropomorphitic. We notice a similar exaggeration of the figurative in two passages of the very beautiful discourse on Mammon-worship. Speaking of England's love of money, the author says (p. 119), "that in few countries is there so much sycophancy as in this; so many creatures ready to crawl round a heap of gold; so many insignificant shoals gleaming around every great ship that rides over the surface of society." And again (p. 120), he say of Duty, that "its healthful power will reveal the sickness of our selfishness, and recal us from the poisonous level of our luxuries and vanities to the reviving breath and mountain heights of God."

We can hardly condemn the following comparison; it is so ingenious and so beautifully expressed, and so well illustrates Mr. Martineau's happy art in borrowing similitudes from science; and yet for the purpose of moral illustration, it seems to us too distinctly objective—too sharply marked off from the train of thought where it occurs. Speaking of the effects of a sudden flash of religious conviction on the spiritual elements pre-existing in the soul, he adds (p. 136), "The mind is ready, like a liquid on the eve of crystallization, to yield up its state on the touch of the first sharp point, and dart, over its surface and in its depths, into brilliant and beautiful forms, and from being turbid and weak as water, to become clear as crystal and solid as the rock." As a set-off to our qualified approval of this passage, we cannot abstain from expressing the fullest admiration of another, at the close of the same discourse (p. 137), perhaps the most eloquent in the volume, where the Author blends a deep wisdom with beautiful poetry in describing the growth of a religious life in the soul.

Fine passages are blemished by the same hardness of figure in other parts of the volume, as where (p. 239) the mind of Christ is called "the sublimest work of the great *Sculptor of souls*;" and (p. 304) "the divine perfections" are said to be "unsusceptible of the *colours of religious emotion*."

The fervid strength of Mr. Martineau's mind which fastens with exclusive intensity on one view of a subject, combined with his quick perception of contrast and his love of novel and startling forms of expression, have once or twice, in our judgment, impaired the perfect soundness of his reasoning not less than the purity of his taste. We will notice a case or two that have occurred to us.—Is it quite fair to represent Paley's theory of Natural Theology as setting forth "the conception of a remote and retired mechanician, inspecting from without the engine of creation to see how it performs?" (p. 19.) Without professing any predilection for the peculiar tendencies of Paley's philosophy, we must confess we have always felt that the concluding chapters of the work referred to breathe the purest spirit of devotion. Passages may be cited from it which repel the charge of his placing the Deity at a distance from his works. In explaining the idea of the Divine personality, he employs a mode of representation not materially different from Mr. Martineau's own; and nothing can be more solemnly religious than his declaration, that to a mind which discerns God in all things, "the world thenceforth becomes a temple, and life itself one continued act of adoration."

What does Mr. Martineau precisely mean (p. 231) by saying, that God has "*invented* human virtue, and breathed into us our private veneration for its greatness?" If by this extraordinary expression he intends to exclude the *utilitarian* constitution of human duty—while we wholly sympathise with the principles which aim at such an exclusion—his language, if we rightly apprehend it, involves, in our view, a confusion of questions quite distinct; the *ultimate* criterion of right and wrong, as viewed by the Divine mind, and the *motives* by which the conduct of finite agents is rendered virtuous. We can conceive of no object so worthy of the ceaseless energy of an all-perfect Being as the production of the greatest possible happiness; but as man cannot grasp this vast design, it is his only wisdom to follow implicitly the sense of right which springs up as a divine direction in his soul—thinking of duty alone, and leaving his happiness with God. But to represent God as *arbitrarily* devising a system of moral discipline, without reference to the general well-being of creation, for the *gratuitous* exercise of his rational offspring—is rather to degrade than to exalt his character.

In p. 251, Mr. Martineau seems to speak contemptuously of all printed forms of devotion, and says, "Prayer by the printing press is surely a very near approach to piety by machinery." Will he forgive us for observing, that in this sentence the appo-

siteness of the comparison is not so conspicuous as the point of the expression? We love and reverence the outpourings of a fresh, spontaneous devotion; and we are aware how much coldness of heart and feebleness of faith are often hid under the forms of piety. But it must never be forgotten, that the ready utterance of prayer, in language fitted to carry with it the sympathy of others, is a natural gift, possessed not even by the same mind at all times in an equal degree; and that in many more minds the elements of deep religious feeling exist, which ask the interpretation of some kindred spirit, offering a vehicle in which they may unburden themselves. And if the unworn and the original has a more stimulating effect, befitting scenes of excitement and times of change—usage and venerable association and the silent power of those holy words through which the pious and the good have for long generations breathed forth the aspirations of their souls, exert a solemn and tranquillising influence, not less suited to the ordinary circumstances of our being and the quiet walks of domestic and social duty. Indeed these influences seem to have a peculiar appropriateness to social worship, where men unite to express their common wants —the sympathies which link them in kindly communion with the Universal Church—the present and the past—the good that are, and the good that have been. The same objection is never made to the use of religious poetry, which is only prayer in verse. And what is there, in the simple transition from poetry to prose, to make that which is becoming in the one case, absurd in the other? Mr. Martineau shall furnish us with an eloquent answer to himself. Speaking of the devotional effusions of departed saints, he exclaims, "What an impressive testimony this to the sameness of our nature through every age, and the immortal perseverance of its holier affections! The language of *their* confessions, their struggles, their desires, speaks our own; the light that gladdened them, shines now upon our hearts; and the mists they could not penetrate, brood now upon our path."—p. 199.

We do not wish to be considered as the advocates of one form of social devotion more than another; for they are adapted to different ends, and may be profitably blended. It is desirable that the devotional spirit should express itself in the greatest variety of forms. It is only to the *exclusiveness* of the foregoing view that we object.

We have expressed our opinion of Mr. Martineau's work with the openness which we felt would be the truest mark of our respect for a mind like his, and which, we are sure, that he would, in a similar case, practise himself. If we have not with-

held our censure from a few points of style and sentiment, the expression of our admiration for the far greater part of his volume has been equally sincere. The very blemishes we have thought it right to notice, seem to spring from a redundancy of mental power. They are the *peccata splendida* of genius, which inferior minds escape, because they are incapable of them. Mr. Martineau is yet only in the noon-tide vigour of his faculties. Time will mellow the harsh, and prune away the luxuriant, and leave a rich and golden fruitage to crown, we trust, the honoured autumn of his years.

The perusal of this volume will, to many minds, exhibit his character in a new light. He has always been admired as a bold thinker and a man of great general ability. Other qualities of his mind are conspicuous here—great practical wisdom, deep insight into human life, and a spirit of the purest devotion. We believe he is destined to accomplish an important work in the religious progress of his country. By the elevated spirituality of his views, and his contempt for sectarian conventionalism, he is better fitted than the adherents to a traditional theology, however liberal, to awaken sympathy in thoughtful minds among the orthodox. Upon his own denomination (whatever prejudices may still exist in some minds which do not know him) his influence, we believe, will be equally beneficial. His writings are calculated to break up its formalism, and through the very boldness which marks them, to bring back an element of genuine piety—the stirrings of a true religious life. Numbers admire his talents and are charmed with his eloquence, and proud of the just honour he confers on his denomination, who, but for these more brilliant endowments, would hardly appreciate the piety, the holy earnestness, and the spiritual wisdom, which are the highest graces of his genius.

J. J. T.

Art. IV.—NEANDER, ON THE UNLIMITED FREEDOM WHICH SHOULD BE GRANTED TO TEACHERS OF DIVINITY.

The following defence of the unrestrained freedom which should be allowed to Theological Teachers, was not published in justification of any free or heretical views held by its distinguished Author, the present learned and eloquent Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Berlin, who is well known to be highly orthodox. It was a word spoken in season, flowing from his love of Truth and Liberty, and breathing a noble and truly Christian spirit. It contains a clear statement of Principles of Investigation, always required for the religious progress of mankind, and not least perhaps by those who, deeming themselves to be in the vanguard of spiritual enlightenment, are not a little jealous of any advance beyond their own station, partly because they have no true understanding or love of their own principles, and partly because they fear that, in the present state of the world, *further progress will spoil all.* We shall follow up the subject in our next number.

"The directors of the *Evangelischen Kirchenzeitungun* (Evangelical Church Magazine) mentioned me in the Prospectus of that Work as one of its Contributors; and it is a fact that I had pledged myself to take a share in their labours. It is also certain that, but for want of leisure, I would have fulfilled my engagement. The relation, however, in which I stood to that periodical is altered. The cause of this change is, that the abovementioned work has on several occasions put forth principles entirely opposed to my own; principles which, if they were acted upon, would, according to my conviction, produce nothing but injury to the Church. Under these circumstances I certainly could not, even if my occupations permitted it, give my assistance to a work with which I am thus at variance; I consider it, therefore, right and proper, publicly to renounce my former connection, without meaning by this step, to interrupt the Christian and Collegial relationship in which I stand with my dear friend the Editor. I trust that kind feeling will, by God's blessing, be always mutual between us. Although in regard to certain principles which affect the point in question, I cannot agree with him, I certainly respect the earnest sincerity of the very principles which I disapprove, and the con-

viction which supports them. Which of us is free from sin and error?

"To come directly to the point,—my objection particularly relates to certain Articles of the Periodical on the Letters of my dear and honoured colleague Professor Schleiermacher, and on several expressions supposed to have dropped from Dr. Gesenius and Dr. Wegscheider, in their lectures. In the first place, I can by no means approve that Journals supposed to be chiefly intended to promote a practical Christian interest, should submit the existing differences of learned Theologians, (whether those differences show themselves in their Lectures or in their Publications,) to the decision of the Laity, who, from want of regular and scientific instruction on such subjects, are unqualified to judge. Nothing, indeed, is more alien from my principles than any intention to establish a distinction between public (exoteric) and secret (esoteric) doctrines, in the Church, or to make the Laity dependent on the authority of Divines; on the contrary, it is because the only difference which I find between these two classes arises from the scientific character of the conviction peculiar to the professional theologian, that I maintain the Laity need not take a direct part in such disputes and inquiries, but should ground their conviction on the Word of God, independently of those opinions, and consider that, in conformity with their peculiar call, they have no concern in what this or that divine says, but in what Christ and his Apostles teach.

"A Layman, who has not received a scientific education in Divinity, is not in circumstances to judge the mutual dependence between the scientific views peculiar to inquiring Theologians, and their Christian life. A Layman cannot be accurately acquainted with the development of Theology, in general, and, still less, with that which is now going on; and consequently cannot perceive the connection of those men's ideas, by putting himself in the place of each, so as to understand the relation of those ideas to their spiritual life. Divines, whose profession lays upon them the duty to ground and defend their Christian conviction by arguments in accordance with the stage at which scientific knowledge has arrived in their own times, have to undergo trials and struggles, from which a Layman, who does not overstep the duties of his station, is exempted. It is, indeed, this very exemption which makes it impossible for the Layman to perceive how hard it is for some Divines, under the peculiarities of their intellectual character, to bring their faith victorious out of those very trials, which a person unacquainted with scientific divinity, totally escapes. Those, therefore, who draw

the attention of the Laity to such detached views of scientific Divines, tempt them to pass many a wrong and uncharitable judgment; with great detriment of that holy duty which binds us to deal tenderly with the good report of our brethren, especially on that point on which we should most spare them, namely, their relation to the Christian community.

"Since the confusion of the things which belong to the scientific development of the Christian doctrines, with those which promote a Christian life by faith, occasioned, in the early centuries of the Church, the most powerful impediments to enlarged Christian knowledge, and produced many errors and corruptions in the general practice of Christianity, we should consider the clearer separation of those two things, which a later age has introduced, as unquestionably useful. This being so, it follows that it is our bounden duty to exert ourselves, to the utmost, in preventing whatever threatens to lead us back into the ancient confusion.

"The Theology of the Evangelical Church is, at this moment, under a crisis, which no wisdom, except that divine one from which the Church of Christ has the promise of security against the Gates of Hell, can lead to a glorious and triumphant result: and to the guidance of that Wisdom alone should we confidently resign ourselves. Human power, external means, employed to suppress any of the mental phenomena which the gradual (or as it might be called, *historical*) development of Christianity, has brought forth,—even if those phenomena should be reducible to partial and false views,—would amount to an encroachment upon the operations of Providence, suggested by an impatient zeal to which those operations seem dilatory: it would be, to the full extent of what God permits to human wilfulness, a disturbance of the divine plan. True it is that man cannot snap asunder the chain of providential events; but it is equally true, that the attempt to wrench it would occasion a violent reaction. Our duty is, therefore, to allow it to unroll itself in that steady and quiet manner which according to the supreme ordinance, will make it surely reach the final point which divine wisdom has appointed. Since the apostolical age, the developing progress of the Christian doctrine, by means of its indwelling divine power, has fought its way forward: one view has acted as a counterpoise to another, till the most opposite found their level. The intrusion of any outward power (and surely any outward power which meddles with the contest between truth and error, must be intrusive) upon that natural process of development which brings about the modified settlement of opposite views, as it were spontaneously, must be fatal. The

history of controversy abounds in melancholy examples, which attest this truth to all ages. Let, therefore, our own take warning and abstain from repeating the vain attempts of former times. The words addressed in 1524 to the elector Frederick of Saxony, by Luther—(by Luther who afterwards deserted the genuine Christian principle which he originally recommended) contain a truly golden sentence for all ages. 'The word of God must take the field, and fight. Let the minds encounter each other, and clash together. Let preachers speak what, and against whom they like.' Yet, (it is said), many will be misled by false doctrines, who might have been won over to the Truth: —the fact is to be lamented, but every attempt to alter it by external means would only make it worse. For it is not given to human power to convey the Truth to the understanding of a generation which is unfolding itself, as a thing ready cut out and prepared for it. No man can be exempted from individual struggle. It would be an absurd beginning, to place a young man who is to be educated scientifically, out of the reach of those contending views which arise in the order of things;— out of those very difficulties through which he is to work his way,—and surround him with an artificial mental atmosphere. We must here say with Luther: 'Are some seduced? let it be so: such is the nature of warfare. Where there is struggling and fighting, there must be killed and wounded; but he that fights bravely will be crowned.'—The Universities have heen established by the wisdom of the Founders, to train our youth to intellectual self-government. Suppose however, that, by an arbitrary arrangement, we close those institutions against every scientific objection which the present age has produced against our theological system: what will be the consequence? The young student must go out into the world, where, in one way or other, those objections will meet him; and his danger will be in proportion to his previous want of opportunities of eliciting and practising a manly and independent intellectual firmness.

"I must, finally, declare myself against the practice of founding charges against the Professors of the University, upon the verbal reports, or the written notes of the Students. Such practice cannot but open a door to unbounded slander, whether it arise from misunderstanding or from wilful perversion: it must confine the freedom of academical teaching, and destroy the mutual confidence of Tutors and Pupils, so desirable in those establishments; it must end in accustoming the mind to a most injurious system of *espionage*.

"*Berlin, Feb.* 22, 1830.

"NEANDER."

Neander's Answer to the Reply of the Editors of the Evangelical Church Magazine.

"It is my intention to examine the answers of the respected Editors of the *Evangelical Church Magazine,* coolly, and one by one.

"The Editors appear to have, in a certain degree, misunderstood my assertion, that the differences which exist among scientific Divines, should not be referred to the judgment of the Laity. This misunderstanding is proved by the charge of inconsistency which they bring against me for having granted at one time, that Laymen were able to derive a personal and independent conviction from the word of God; and, subsequently denied them the fitness to try and judge contending opinions. I must, first of all, explain my meaning of the word Laymen. I use not that name to express the opposite of Priests; for I acknowledge only one Priest, in the strictest and highest sense —Him, namely, who has reconciled us with God, and sanctified us. Through Him are all those who, through Faith have appropriated to themselves the reconciliation and sanctification which are grounded in Christ,—through Him are all such consecrated Priests. Every one, who in the spirit of love, and self-denial fulfills the duties to which God has called him, performs the office of a Priest in those duties. As contrasted with each other the names of Priests and Laymen, are not admissible in regard to the Christian community, in whatsoever degree the meaning of those names may be modified. The name of Priest alone is applicable to Christians. I use the word Layman, in the sense in which it is usually applied when, in every department of knowledge, the regularly instructed are distinguished from those who want scientific qualification. I class with the *Unlaymen* (CLERKS in the ancient signification of that English word) every one who has acquired that *material* and *formal* knowledge which belongs, in general, to the essence of a scientifically educated Divine. I purposely join the *material* and *formal* parts of theological knowledge, because men are found, who having acquired some *materials* of theological knowledge, are still deficient in regard to the arrangement and mutual dependence of those materials—which is the *formal* part of theology. Such persons must not only be placed in the general class of Laymen, but of such Laymen as, owing to the half knowledge they possess, are the more easily betrayed into over-confident, superficial, and uni-lateral conclusions. I attribute the scientific education, which is the distinguishing mark be-

tween Laymen and Clerks (Unlaymen) particularly to those who are called by the Christian community to be Ministers of the word of God, and to such as are appointed to educate those Ministers, on the ground that, by virtue of their office, they are bound in conscience to possess those scientific qualifications. The coexistence of other avocations with that theological knowledge, must be considered as quite accidental.*

"It follows then that I have not spoken of Christian conviction in general, but only so far as that conviction shows itself in a scientifically connected form. Granting, as I do, that Laymen may derive from the Scripture a personal, independent, conviction respecting the substance of the Christian doctrine, I must necessarily imply that Laymen are entitled to judge of every thing which opposes it—of every thing which concerns the *substance* of that christian knowledge which is necessary to salvation. But it does not at all follow from this that such persons are capable of forming a right judgment concerning a definite theological system, in general, or of the individual views which hold their place in it, as in a consistent whole. Nor does it follow from this that the Layman either loses or foregoes any advantages in point of Faith. He, on the contrary, may enjoy the divine gift which he possesses, the more peacefully and confidently, for the very reason that, from his not having anything to do with those theological questions, he could not engage in them without trespassing upon ground which does not belong to him. But suppose that a particular view, detached from some connected and unfolded theological system, is presented to the unprepared Layman; suppose he perceives in that view something which, owing to the connection of his own religious ideas, appears to him a most fatal error: in such circumstances the natural consequence will be that whatever partial truth, whatever portion of the true Christian elements may lie at the bottom of the offensive view, to be discovered only by an examination of the connected theological system, will be totally overlooked; and the alarmed Layman will be directly inclined to pull up the tares together with the wheat. He will be induced to forget the law of Christian charity which bids us rejoice in whatever is good and true, wherever it may be found; to acknowledge it even where it is turbid and mixed; and thus to promote the same candour in others.† The offence against this law of charity will be the more grievous if

* In Germany a professor of Divinity need not be a Clergyman. Neander himself, one of the most distinguished of those Professors, does not belong to the clergy.—*Transl.*

† (Charity) rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.—1 Cor. xiii. 6, 7.

it should happen that the Divine who is thus dragged helpless before the judgment seat of the Unlearned, is a man in whom, even those who differ most from his peculiar views on many an important point, must acknowledge the sincerest wish 'not to lay other foundation than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ:' a man whom the spirit of God has employed as an instrument to promote and establish an epoch in the progressive development of Theology, whose important and blessed results will be everywhere visible, in the future improvements of Divinity and the Church, as the present age proceeds in its course, and the judgment of God, by submitting to the fire of time, the structure which this man has made up of heterogeneous materials, shall have taught us to distinguish the gold, the silver, the precious stones, the wood, the hay, the stubble.*

"Still more fatal will be the consequences of such uncharitable conduct, if the man in question should be a minister of the Word, who inspired by the love of the Saviour whom we all acknowledge, and raised above the limits of his own system, by the Spirit which proceeds from the love of Christ, and breathes in the preaching of every sincere believer, has sown abroad the good seed; for, in that case, the fruits of his ministry will be suspected, and the edification which the Spirit of God may have worked through him will be lost. The apostle of the Gentiles felt much otherwise, when he expressed his joy at finding that Christ was preached in all manner of ways:† yet we have historical grounds to believe that the persons of whom he speaks maintained errors in regard to Justification, and the person of Christ, which border upon what is now called Socinianism, and Rationalism. The apostle, nevertheless, rejoices because the imperfect knowledge of Christ which was thus spread among the people, might be a preparatory step towards a higher and less defective view. Since the attraction of the Father which draws men to the Son, meets them at various points of their intellectual and moral development, it follows that Christ must also condescend to the wants and weaknesses of individuals, becoming all things to all men, suiting every one's circumstances, so that having obtained admittance to their hearts, he may lead them into a more perfect knowledge of his glory. Shall we, on the contrary, set up a narrow and uniform Dogmatism, which must here pare off and there add, just so much

* This seems to be said in allusion to Professor Schleiermacher; a man whose piety was equal to his preeminent talents and learning, and whose preaching was extremely useful to those who habitually heard him.—*Transl.*

† Philip. i. 18.—What then? notwithstanding every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice.

as will reduce every thing to its own dimensions? Shall we thus set bounds, and give laws, to the fostering grace of God?

"Applicable to all periods as this consideration must be acknowledged to be, it is especially so to the great crisis which, at this moment, is preparing in the Church a Reformation of which the scope and process are known only to God. When Faith, passing through a variety of transitions during its struggle with Unbelief, shall have assumed a settled outline, as the result of that very struggle,—then shall we see the living power of primitive Christianity evolve naturally the Form best suited to its activity. A mass of materials inherited from earlier times, if not actuated, enlivened, and modelled out by the internal power which rules the mental life of our own age, must for ever continue a heavy dead weight, and in opposition with every really living thing around it.

"To form a right opinion of the doctrines of former times is given only to men, who, by means of a correct historical acquaintance with the progress of theological knowledge, and the peculiar circumstances of those times, can place themselves as living observers of those ages. Men, on the contrary, who, wanting this power,—a power which cannot be obtained but through that course of study which I call theological education,—men who, guided only by a certain devotional spirit, undertake to write ecclesiastical history, as if, independently of all scientific knowledge, they were composing a popular pious book, frequently produce distorted pictures of the early ages of the Church, missing the really Christian principle which, under many a ruffled form, showed itself active in those ages. Thus if a Layman meets, for instance, with some detached point of doctrine maintained by Marcion or Origen, without being acquainted with the whole chain of theological notions and feelings of those two men, he will probably be inclined to deny them the name of Christians: whereas a more deep and accurate knowledge of the subject shows, on the contrary, that some of their errors arise directly from a lively, though mistaken Christian interest; that others have their source not in any want of a Christian spirit, but rather in some mistake of the logical understanding, and lastly, that in the controversies of those times the mixture of truth and error was so general, on all sides, that it was impossible to obtain a satisfactory conviction of the Christian truth till a long opposition had brought it to light. Suppose that a narrow-minded, blind, zeal had succeeded in crushing, at once, the theological school of Origen: such an event would have put a sudden stop to the natural progress and development of the Christian doctrines. This is indeed clear

from the remarkable change which this great Christian teacher produced on all the detached theological views then prevalent. The extremes into which the spirit of that age was running, were such that no less a man than Origen (subject as he was, like everything human, to faults and imperfections) could interfere successfully for the purpose of reconciling the contending tendencies on the subject of Christianity. The application of this example to our own times is obvious.

"Rightly to judge, however, respecting the contending views of our own time is still more difficult, because we see them before they have attained their full development, and because we find ourselves directly concerned in them. A great part of the subjects discussed in the ancient controversies, as they present themselves to us under forms which do not directly affect our inward Christian principles, appear to us as mere dogmatic subtleties. But if we examine those points with scientific accuracy, we shall find them intimately connected with the questions which, in a different form, are now agitating the Christian world.

"Our honoured opponents proceed, however, on the unqualified supposition that in our present controversies, all, on the one side, is error, and all, on the other, is truth. Were it so, we might indeed give ourselves no trouble. The Evangelical Church would have only to reject whatever is not in strict conformity with its tenets; and this would be enough to restore her to her original purity. But even in that case, the truth received by a kind of passive tradition, would be of no avail to individuals, since it is only by personal examination, and the necessary struggle attending it, that the truth can become our own. Yet all controversies, which have taken place during the progress of Christianity, show how closely and variously mixed Truth and Error have always been. Nor can this fact surprise any one who considers that since Flesh and Spirit can never be totally unmixed in our present state, we must be under the constant necessity of progressive purification and reform. It cannot be denied that what is called Rationalism has been raised up in our Church by the existing mixture of divine and of human doctrines in our Creed, and that it has grown in opposition to a notional Orthodoxy, and to a servile submission to a dead letter. In the state wherein at one time the Evangelical Church found itself, no process of purification could take place without some opposition of this kind. The time will certainly come, and it has already begun, when it will be fully perceived how much benefit the living growth of Theology has derived from this contest. But no such advantage could have

been obtained unless the principle of Rationalism had been allowed to develope itself to its natural fulness. Had the German Evangelical Church held her doctrines in the shape of an inherited dead capital (as is the case in other Churches), or had some secular or ecclesiastical power excluded Rationalism at once, the living progress, of which we speak, would have been at an end. Under such circumstances, the false conceptions of Christianity against which that power had been exerted, would have been strengthened by opposition, and instead of allowing the Controversy to elicit a body of doctrine still more purified and in stricter conformity with the living principle of Christianity, a dead *notional* Orthodoxy, not unfrequently fostering within itself the seeds of the Rationalism which force had apparently banished and extinguished, would have been entailed on the Church. Suppose, again, that this principle of rejection had been allowed full sway; every analogy of history shows us what would have been the result: at first, Rationalism in its grossest form would have been banished; yet it would have reappeared in some other shape. Here again we should see people applying some more decided measure to remove from the Church the very last seed of Rationalism, till, by the repeated process of purification, only that class of minds would remain in it who can press themselves into a dead, inflexible, dogmatic frame. Let us not compare Germany with those countries in which the tendency to an outward, practical, activity predominates, and where, as soon as a lively faith obtained the victory over unbelief, Theology stept in with its scientific forms, and, without having gone through such a crisis as ours, continues to rule according to settled and unchangeable views. The German mental character absolutely requires that advancing science and practical life should be completely amalgamated: the peculiarities of other nations cannot illustrate our case: let us therefore abstain from bringing England and Scotland as examples fit to guide us on this point.

"Our respected Reviewer asserts that the Faculty of Divinity has been the fountain-head from which Unbelief has overflowed Germany. It must certainly be expected that where free vehicles of the living and active spirit of each succeeding age exist, they should be the main instruments to bring forth such portions of Error and Truth, as the progressive activity of each period elicits. So it was indeed that the Faculty of Theology established the dominion of a withering Scholasticism; so it was that the Faculty of Divinity, in the beginning of the fifteenth century, produced that agitation at Prague, which roused a dead Faith into life; so it was that the Faculty of Divinity accom-

plished the Reformation one hundred years later. No: we should not bring such partial accusations against any one class or profession. All are liable to similar charges. If the mass of the people were animated by a living Faith, whatever theoretical Unbelief might proceed from Divines, would find a check in the godly power of that Faith. If the people were led by a truly pious spirit, their influence would be felt by the Divines themselves, so as to help them in the development of scientific Theology. I fully agree with the Reviewer in what he says with respect to the reaction of the lately awakened Christian spirit. But by Christian Spirit, I understand no other than that which proceeds from a Faith which shows itself through Love; such as exerts itself within the limits of each man's walk of life; such as employs itself in amending whatever is amiss in that respective walk; such as fully perceiving how much Christians, of the same condition, fall short of the heavenly standard proposed to them, is too much occupied with the difficulties of its own task, to go about spying out faults in the work of others. I certainly cannot believe that this kind of Christian Spirit would be promoted by inviting the Laity to dogmatize and argue upon the present theological differences of opinion: for it is very probable that while their zeal was raging on these points, their own duties might fall into neglect. Censure of others is intimately connected with self-approbation; and, even without our knowing it, our pride may be revelling in the condemnation which we pass upon our brethren. We cannot indeed wish for the renewal of the scenes which in the fourth century took place in Constantinople; when the Arian Controversy occupied the highest and the lowest classes; when nothing else was heard in the shops of bakers, and the booths of old Clothesmen, though a general indifference to practical Christianity possessed the people in exact proportion to the controversial activity.

"Following the steps of the Review, I come now to the second point, namely the interference of the secular power with the process which unfolds the principles of Theological learning. I might indeed refer myself to several principles, directly connected with this point, as they have been stated above; but I will consider the question by itself. In the first place, I fully agree with the Reviewer as to the right and duty of every Government to see that nothing opposed to justice, or dangerous to public order, lurks in the character and principles of any Christian Society. But I cannot approve the ground on which the Reviewer asserts this right of inspection—namely the union 'which not long since the Demagogues had formed with Rationalism.' Here, first of all, I conceive it a clear duty, where a

question turns upon a particular system, or mental tendency, carefully to avoid names of such vague and various import, as Demagogue has been at all periods—a name which, from the indefiniteness of its signification, may be easily applied most unjustly. The Emperor Julian condemned Athanasius as a Demagogue: the primitive Christians appeared to the narrow-minded Proconsuls and Presidents as political demagogues of the most dangerous kind. Why?—Because those who wanted the power of perceiving what it was that bound together, supported, and multiplied the members of the new sect, had recourse to external objects and interests, as explanations of these facts. So is the name RATIONALISM employed, at this moment, in various, and indefinite senses. The above charge appears therefore to me an instance of that odious art of consequence-making, which attributes to others whatever practical consequences we fancy to follow from their abstract views. Where indeed is the necessary and internal connection of the views commonly attributed to Demagogues, and those implied in Rationalism? Can such a connection be proved unless, in the most unjust and improper manner, we embrace in the idea of a Demagogue every quality which stands opposed to a servile Spirit? On that supposition the same charge would eminently apply to the Spirit of the Gospel whose principle it is—'be not ye the servants of men;'* and well indeed might the Gospel glory in a charge which so highly ennobles it. But even if individuals, who might be called Rationalists had unduly and intrusively engaged in Politics, no man would be justified, on that ground, in asserting a general connection between the Rationalist and the Demagogue: for, in contrast with such individuals, a long, long, list of Rationalists might be brought, whose loyalty and true public spirit are unimpeachable. After all, nothing is easier than to retort such accusations. Theology, at all events, should abstain from reproaches, which are apt to connect Divinity questions with concerns and interests totally alien from its object, and to expose Christianity to that evil which at all times has been most fatal to its spirit, namely the change of Christ's Kingdom into a Kingdom of this World.

"With respect to the interference of the State in matters concerning the progressive Doctrines of the Church, I must insist upon the principle already laid down—the principle which both the spirit of the Gospel and the progressive testimony of history point out—that the contest between Truth and Error, in theology, should be out of the reach of all external power. I totally dissent from the Reviewers, when, rejecting scientific conviction

* 1 Cor. vii. 23.

as the central point which the IDEA of an Evangelical Church, —and the very notion of Christianity,—demands, they contend for one empirically given. Now this can never be allowed in subjects with which our Reason is concerned; else we should expose ourselves to the consequence, that if anything absurd, if anything inconsistent with the very essence of Christianity, had crept by mistake among the externals of a Church, it must remain as an inviolable law for ever. It is, on the contrary, to be expected that, in proportion to the progress of knowledge, all that is implied in the original conception will more and more assert its power, and gradually change what is external, so as to correspond more nearly to the spiritual model. It would be a monstrous thing if, when progressive development were inviting us to advance, we should consider ourselves in duty bound to fall back, and practically to return to the antiquated errors of past ages. According to such a principle every degree of spiritual despotism, and even the terrors of the Inquisition, must have acquired legitimacy wherever they have been once established.

" Concerning the point before us, it must be acknowledged that the spirit of the Reformation failed originally to form a clear conception of its work. Hence it was that many errors of the Canon Law were unconsciously transferred into the discipline of the Protestant Churches. One portion of the Reformed Divines entertained, in addition to this, the notion that the Theocracy of the Old Testament and the economy of the New are identical, and that the two religious systems should be combined together. Luther, a man who on many points was far above his age, had originally arrived at the principle that Faith should unfold itself out of the intimate perception of the Gospel, by the free activity of its own spirit; but the troubles and commotions produced by the controversy on the Lord's Supper, and by the Bohemian War obscured his mind, and made him lose sight of that principle. At a subsequent period the false, controversial zeal of Divines, who identified their *subjective* conviction with the essence of Christianity, implored the assistance of the secular arm, as it had been done in earlier ages. The gradual development of Theology (a development which as it accompanies the course of events may be called the historical development) has, in our own times, exerted a salutary activity, in Germany; and we may well attribute this beneficial result to its having exerted itself negatively, *i. e.* in the removal of obstacles which obstructed the internal and creative progress of the Christian Spirit, and in snapping asunder the yoke of old forms. Wherever it has been attempted to check this Theological crisis by means external to the working minds which produce it, the

result was such an exposure of the impotence of those means, as only provoked a more violent reaction. The German Governments, and especially our own, have shown, by the regulations through which they have rendered the Universities the means of raising our youth to a well grounded feeling of mental independence, that they are animated by the improved spirit of our times, and far from wishing to revive the old errors, which so long cramped the progress of the Church. Thanks be to God, we have not for our King a Constantine, a Justinian, a Louis the Fourteenth: we are not under a prince who wishes to intrude himself upon the spiritual body of Christ, as King and Lawgiver, usurping the place of Him to whom alone the dignity of King and Lawgiver of his church belongs, and who alone can exercise that office through the agency of his spirit. Thanks be to God, we have a king who thinks it the highest honour to be a servant of Christ in the midst of his brother Christians, and who, through the power of his example, undoubtedly contributes more to the enlightenment and benefit of his people than all the edicts and proclamations which ever were published on Theological Controversies.

"Consistently with the main principle of the Evangelical Church—that all revelation of God to man must always be obscured and disturbed by the sinfulness which clings to our nature,—consistently, I say, with this principle the Evangelical Church cannot wish for a dead, unchangeable Unity in her traditional doctrines: for the direct consequence of the principle just mentioned is a constant necessity of purification and improvement through the activity of the spirit of Christ. The Evangelical Church must be far from wishing to stop and fetter the progress and development of her doctrine for the sake of a work, which though a glorious manifestation, in modern times, of the power of the Christian Spirit, was nevertheless the work of men, and as such necessarily imperfect. Luther nobly declared himself against such a wish, in the Preface to the first document which in 1527 appeared from the pen of Melanchthon, in the character of a profession of Faith of the Evangelical Church. It was called the *Visitation Articles.* 'We cannot,' says Luther, 'allow this document to appear as a binding injunction, lest we should be setting up a new collection of Popish Decretals: we give it only as an account or history, as well as a testimony and confession of our belief.' In every human profession of Faith we should distinguish the immutable essence of the Evangelical truth, from the varying forms which belong to its progressive development;—we should not confound the pure work of the Spirit (to use the language of Scripture) with the obscuring

power of the flesh, which always mixes itself with the former. If we neglect this distinction we necessarily fall into the Romish error about Tradition; but with this disadvantage in comparison with the Church of Rome—that at all events, by the supposition of an infallible and perpetual organ of tradition appointed by Christ, her system is consistent. The case is quite different with us: for, upon the ground taken by the Evangelical Church, where shall she find this infallible Oracle? Shall we say with the Review; 'for this purpose has the State its Divines?' But this is begging the question: for, on the supposition that the Divines are divided on the very substance of the evangelical doctrine, we must ask which party of Divines is to be followed?

"What the Review proposes would come to this: that, the progress of the Church would be, as in old times, at the mercy of that party of Divines who should succeed in obtaining as it were a *patent* of Orthodoxy according to the judgment of the political Rulers, who, as men, are exposed to the influence of partial views and erroneous notions.

"NEANDER."

Berlin, March 7th 1830.

Art. V.—RECENT WORKS ON THE ATONEMENT.

1. *Letters to a Friend on the Doctrines of the Trinity and the Atonement.* By George Walker.
2. *Four Discourses on the Sacrifice and Priesthood of Jesus Christ.* By John Pye Smith, D.D., F.R.S.
3. *Letters to the Rev. John Pye Smith, D.D., occasioned by the recent republication of his Four Discourses, &c.* By George Vance Smith, B.A.
4. *Lectures on the Scripture Doctrine of Atonement or of Reconciliation through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.* By the late Lant Carpenter, LL.D.

The appearance of these works—all of which, excepting the second, have been published during the last year—indicates the attention which Unitarian controversialists are beginning to concentrate on what is unquestionably the most prominent and the most important feature of the religious system which they impugn. The Atonement, of all the doctrines of Orthodoxy, has most hold on the feelings of its professors, and most show of support in the phraseology of the Scriptures. It has in consequence been, (looking at it merely in a controversial point of view), the Trinitarian's strongest ground, and the Unitarian's weakest. We think that symptoms of the consciousness of this fact have not been wanting on either side. Arguments on the Trinity, original sin, eternal punishment, and other topics in the popular system of divinity, the Unitarian has offered us without number; but the atonement, it seems to us, has been less frequently discussed, and then with very inferior success. Not that the Unitarian has doubted, in the smallest degree, the entire falsehood of the doctrine, but that he has felt very sensibly the difficulty of discussing it on the popular grounds, namely, the feelings of the believer and the phraseology of the Scriptures; and, on the other hand, how many thousands of unpledged Trinitarians are there, who will cede point after point connected with the other doctrines, with comparative indifference, but hold to the doctrine of the atonement as the most precious if not the most unquestionable in their creed.

There might have been a time when the Atonement was an appendage doctrine of the Trinity, but we are very certain that the reverse is now rapidly taking place, and that the Trinity is becoming an appendage-doctrine to the Atonement. We are

glad, therefore, to see this mustering of forces on the latter ground. We do not ourselves think that the argument is yet made out on the Unitarian side, with a sufficient agreement in first principles and general views of Scripture to produce any very profound impression on the Orthodox mind. But every fresh labourer seems to bring some additional contribution of value, and we do not despair of seeing the argument reduced ere long to a compact and available form. The two great points to be achieved are, first, to show that the Scripture phraseology, usually supposed to support the doctrine of atonement, has no genuine meaning at all favourable to it, and secondly, to show how the infinite mercy of God must be as sufficient a ground of trust as the infinite atonement of Christ could have ever appeared to be. At present the attempts to explain Scripture proceed upon so many different principles, and are often so subtle in their character, that they fail to leave an impression of the requisite depth and distinctness on the orthodox mind, which is habituated to a far more determined and palpable meaning. But we are persuaded that the various independent efforts now made to put this doctrine on its proper footing, will result in a view as cogent and satisfactory, as the process of arriving at it seems to be gradual and slow.

We take up Mr. Walker's book first, as having lain longest upon our table. The circumstances in which it originated are interesting.

"During the author's residence in a retired village in France, it was his good fortune to make the acquaintance of three English ladies of highly liberal and cultivated minds, but strictly orthodox in all their religious opinions. In reply to an invitation to join them in the morning service of the Church of England, he urged his objections to its doctrines, particularly those of the Trinity and the Incarnation. He was then referred to the various texts on which these dogmas mainly depend, requesting his own explanation of them, as well as the grounds in general of his dissent. It was with no small distrust of his competency to the task, that he entered upon an examination of these passages; for he confesses that his opinions upon these subjects were more the result of early association, and, he may say, of a kind of hereditary prejudice, than of any serious and candid inquiry. Under the circumstances also in which he was placed, deprived of every resource, he had no other means of information than what could be derived from a diligent study of the Scriptures, as the only book to which he could have access. The result of this, he hopes, impartial investigation, is contained in the following letters."

And a very remarkable production, the circumstances of the case considered, these letters must be admitted to be. Some

traces of that "hereditary" influence, of which the author speaks as having previously to this inquiry very much guided his convictions, we may be allowed to trace also in his manly understanding and his earnest and vigorous style. The fine old man of Nottingham and Manchester is often resuscitated to our imagination in these pages; his bold and masculine spirit reappears in his descendant, and something too of that warmth of temperament, by which tradition says he was distinguished; for our author as he gets deeper in his argument becomes warmer in his language, and we have sometimes thought that his lady correspondents must have had firm nerves or most kindly spirits, if they did not become a little alarmed, or a little angry, with the occasional vehemence of his remonstrances. But, in truth, it is scarcely possible to enter for the first time thoroughly into the details of the popular doctrines, and laboriously to follow out their course with the pen, without at length feeling something of the indignation of the author, when he says, p. 91, speaking of the doctrine of satisfaction, "God forgive me, if I err, but in all the records of cruelty and crime, in all the frightful exhibition of Pagan rites, in all the ferocious excesses of superstition and fanaticism, I know nothing that can be placed beside it." And we have long thought so too, but a certain coolness, that grows upon us by use, prevents us now from often saying so.

Mr. Walker's Letters consist essentially of two parts: one, composed of the initiatory and concluding letters, in which he treats principally of the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Trinity: and the other, forming the body of the work, on the doctrine of the Atonement. The mode of handling the subjects is not, as was to be expected, strictly methodical, but such as would naturally arise from the character of a friendly discussion by correspondence. The author leaps into the heart of his subject by boldly grappling with the epistolary texts, and especially with the Epistle to the Hebrews as a whole. On the eighth, ninth, and greater part of the tenth chapters, he gives a commentary. He starts with the hypothesis, that the Priesthood of Christ was typified in the Priesthood of the Old Testament; at least he thinks it evident that St. Paul perceived and wished to demonstrate, that a strict analogy subsisted between the two. Of this there can be no doubt, (supposing for the moment that the Epistle to the Hebrews is St. Paul's,) but we are inclined to think the analogy was *ex post facto*, and developed by the writer for the better conviction of his Hebrew correspondents, and not originally designed, in the strict form of type and anti-type; though Mr. Walker seems to prefer the

latter supposition, for he says,—" All these ceremonies of the law were so many types of Christ; the direct application of which to him was therefore imperative; no longer a matter of choice, but of necessity; it was requisite to show that in him the law was completed, and all these ceremonies received their final accomplishment—what they were in appearance, he was in reality and supereminently."—Letters, p. 42, 43.

Assuming that this correspondence as between type and antitype, or at least this close analogy, is essential to the Epistolary argument, he shows with great acuteness and variety of statement, that the Doctrine of Atonement commonly held, entirely destroys it. He shows, that the atonement, ordained by the law, was merely an act of purification; was often made for inevitable defilements, where no sin or disobedience could exist; that it was sometimes made by fine flour; that the ceremony was precisely the same, whether it was for objects and places of worship, or for voluntary or inevitable defilements, and therefore it is deprived altogether of the character of an atonement in the common sense of the word; that it was simply a figurative lustration; that it could not be an expiation for guilt where none existed, and therefore cannot be indicative of any such quality in Christ's blood. He shows how, with the common view of the atonement, the analogy between the High Priest's entrance into the Holy of Holies and Christ's entrance into the presence of God, entirely fails. The atonement makes the shedding of Christ's blood necessary for *our* entrance, but the analogy requires that it should be necessary for *his own*. " By his own blood *he*, not *we*, entered in, having obtained for us eternal redemption; that is, his blood was essential to the perfecting of himself before he could enter in as the redeemer of others; if then it was an atonement for the latter, it was equally so for himself." The writer's " object was to show the Jews, that the purification of the High Priest by blood, to enable him to act as a mediator, was figurative of the power with which Christ was invested, through the merits of his own blood" (or submission unto death) " as the mediator of the world." " It was for Christ himself that his blood and sacrifice were efficacious; it was to qualify himself, before he could present others to be the objects of God's favour." He was himself to be made perfect through the extreme of suffering, to prove that he was worthy of the stewardship to be assigned him.

Finally, our Author points out that the justification by faith and the justification by blood cannot mean different things, but must mean the same. The express doctrine of the Epistle to

the Romans is, that salvation comes by faith in Jesus. Other parts of the New Testament cannot assert that salvation is through Christ's blood, unless there be the same meaning substantially conveyed by both expressions, which our Author accordingly endeavours to prove at length. Such is a rapid outline of the main positions of these letters, and though there are some assertions in them to the correctness of which the practised Theologian would demur, the argument is maintained, we must say, with extraordinary freshness and power.

2. For Dr. Pye Smith's learning and attainments we have the highest respect. And—unfeignedly shocked, as we are sure he himself would be at such an observation—it is not his opinions that throw a halo over his learning, but his learning that imparts a kind of borrowed respectability to his opinions. The volume of Discourses and Notes before us is an illustration of this. We cannot find that Dr. Smith modifies in any way the Doctrine of Atonement as usually received. He holds it in its full extravagance and horror. He eschews, indeed, the exploded form in which it has been sometimes combatted as representing that the Sacrifice of Christ made God gracious, and changed wrath into love. But he earnestly maintains its vicarious character, asserting that "*he put himself in the place* of mankind, and suffered as if he had been a transgressor, in order that they might be delivered from the guilt, or legal condemnation of their sins, and, *by consequence*, from the pollution and practical power of sin:" p. 38. And he quotes with approbation the sentiment of Michaelis, that "it (the satisfaction of Christ) is not a case of transfer of penalty that is factitious, or existing only in appearance; but it was an actual, real, and earnest enduring of penalty."—p. 342. He adheres, too, to the assertion that "the sacrifice of Christ is a full and perfect *satisfaction* to the honour and justice of the divine government in pardoning and saving sinners," p. 47; and maintains that it was requisite ere the divine justice could forego the exaction of the penalty of our sins.

Nor is all this maintained in any oblivion of the revolting nature of the sacrificial idea itself. Dr. Smith even believes in its divinity, from the fact that it is too horrible to have occurred to the imagination of man. "The origin of sacrifices," he says, "we have good reason to regard as from Heaven, and not of men"—"The sacrifice of blood and death, *if an idea so revolting could have sprung up in a sinner's mind*, could not have been offered to God *without impiety*, nor would he have accepted it, had not his own authority previously pointed the way by an explicit prescription."—p. 10.

Though these Discourses abound in logical forms, in skilful statement, and in varied learning, we cannot see that the outline of the argument differs materially from that usually followed. The first Discourse treats of the General Nature of Sacrifices, their supposed symbolical character, and application to Christ, and the peculiar characteristics of Christ's own sacrifice. The second contemplates Christ as the one true Priest—the third contemplates him as making atonement for sin, and the fourth as redeeming from the penalty. But these principal topics are interspersed with many subsidiary ones, and a large collection of supplementary matter is appended to the Lectures, containing quotations from a variety of writers, from Hyginus and Grotius to Madame de Stael—Dr. Smith taking the trouble to transcribe from the latter a paragraph beginning thus—"I consider sacrifices as the basis of all religion, and the *death of Abel*" (a murder, arising from passion and jealousy) "as the first type of that sacrifice which forms the groundwork of Christianity."—p. 227. The Four Discourses present, to our taste, a much more methodical treatment of the subject, than their Two celebrated Predecessors from the pen of Dr. Magee, or rather, we should say, the two celebrated volumes: for the title of Discourses in both cases misleads, and the form of Discourses is in both cases unsuitable. Dr. Smith's work contains, in a much smaller compass, all that is essential to the argument, and will be a much more used and popular book than the Archbishop's. It is free also from the rancour to his opponents which disgraces Dr. Magee. There is indeed one warning (but it is a friendly warning) which Dr. Smith pronounces for our benefit, which, out of our respect for him, we will extract. After a quotation from Tittmann, describing what we suppose would be called a form of Neology in Germany, Dr. S. says:—

"I cordially wish that the Unitarians of this country would seriously consider whether they are not treading in a path, whose character and tendency coincides with that against which the German Professor thus raised his faithful protest. There are symptoms, in no small degree alarming, adverse to this desire and discouraging to our hopes. Books have been published in our country, with appearances of having flowed out of the fountain to which I have alluded; books boasting of pure ideal Christianity, and of Christian Theism, and pretending to assign an origin to Christianity, which, perhaps a little disguised, turns out to be merely human. The tendency, indeed the avowal, is to a system of revived Pantheism—Atheism in almost its horrid nakedness, for the thin veil is only an insult to the understandings of men;—the system of Hegel and Strauss. The short expression of this folly is, that there is no personal, intellectual, presiding God, but that God is the universe,

and the universe is God; that the individual man has no conscious existence after death; but that the human nature subsists on an infinite succession of individuals, the particular men indeed dying, but the race ever renewed, and therefore possessing the properties of an antecedent eternity and all infinite and finite attributes; 'God become man, the infinite renouncing itself to finiteness, and the finite spirit reminding itself of its own infinity; it is the child of the visible mother and the invisible father, of spirit and nature; it is the worker of miracles, it is sinless, it is the dying, the rising, and the heaven-ascending. Through faith in this Christ, namely in his death and in his resurrection, man becomes righteous before God; that is, through the animation of the idea of humanity in itself, namely in the proportion of the power of the negation of naturalness and sensitiveness, which itself is already the negation of the spirit; thus the negation of the negation is the only way for man to the true spiritual life, [and thus] also the individual becomes a partaker of the God-man life of the [whole] kind.'—'This is the key to the whole doctrine concerning Christ.' Strauss Leben Jesu, vol. ii. pp. 767-8."—Discourses, p. 174.

We have had to keep our eye very close on the several portions of the above extract from Strauss, lest we should fail to convey the words, as we certainly do not expect to convey the meaning, to our readers. But that Dr. Smith should seriously apprehend a tendency in the Unitarians of this country to fall into the above mythical dreams of the great German speculator, is really amusing. Does he not see who are in danger here? Let us make a compromise with him, and take the former part of his warning to ourselves, and present him with the latter part back again for the believers in the Trinity and incarnation. It is *they*, when the common doctrines appear too palpably incongruous and gross for their reception, who will be likely to fall into some mythical mode of representing them such as the above, which, divesting the doctrines of their grosser absurdity, shall protect, and make them quasi-credible, by a garment of transcendentalism.

3. Mr. Vance Smith does not allow the republication of his namesake's Discourses to pass by unnoticed, or his argument to remain unquestioned. He does not indeed profess to reply to Dr. Smith's Work as a whole, nor to enter into regular combat with the Author according to the professed rules of controversial war. But when this Goliath steps forth upon the field in the full panoply of, we suppose, nearly half a century's collected learning, Mr. Smith, like a youthful David, scandalized that the armies of the Lord should hear this challenge and not accept it, advances to the stream of a purer theology, and

selecting a few smooth stones out of the brook, plants them with accuracy and precision directly in the forehead of the giant.

Mr. Smith charges the learned Doctor with entire neglect of a very obvious and perfectly indispensable canon of theological criticism, namely, that it is incumbent in the support of an argument founded on the testimony of the sacred writers, "to take into consideration the various institutions, circumstances, opinions, feelings, prejudices, amidst and under the influence of which the writers and original readers of the New Testament Scriptures lived, in order to understand those Scriptures, in the sense in which they were originally intended."

"I know, indeed," he observes, "that it may be said, in reply to all this, that in your interpretation of the texts in question you have given them the sense in which you *think* they were 'originally intended.' But, Sir, this is manifestly not enough, for the satisfaction, much less the conviction, of any one but yourself. The meaning of the Sacred writers is, we cannot doubt, a fixed, determinate, though, it may be, unknown quantity; the value of which is to be settled, not by the arbitrary sentence of any individual mind, but simply by observing the necessary conditions of its discovery;—by duly considering, so far as we can ascertain them, the various circumstances and influences amidst, and with immediate reference to which, the authors, whom we seek to understand, lived and wrote. No interpreter can be allowed to put his own meaning into the words of Scripture unguided by such considerations. Truly this would be carrying the right of private judgment rather too far."

So far we have assertion merely for assertion, Mr. Smith declaring that the Doctor has not taken the original circumstances into consideration, and Dr. Smith virtually no doubt declaring that he has. But not content with this assertion, which would have left the controversy in an unsatisfactory position, Mr. Smith proceeds to substantiate his charge. He omits specific notice of the Epistle to the Hebrews, because, he says, "the doubt which at an early period in the history of Christianity, hung over, and still hangs over, the authorship of this portion of the New Testament, clearly indicates one important principle; which is, that the Epistle to the Hebrews, whatever confirmation it may afford to the doctrines and statements of the undoubted writings of Paul, yet should not be allowed to suggest the interpreting idea for those writings. It must, on the contrary, submit to receive that idea from them; that is to say, we must first ascertain the leading doctrines of the Apostle's undoubted writings, and then we must interpret

the Epistle to the Hebrews in harmony with, in subordination to, such doctrines."—Letters, p. 17.

Our Author then proceeds to detail some of the circumstances and conditions of mind, by a consideration of which we can alone arrive at the correct understanding of the meaning of Apostolic phraseology. He alludes to the zeal manifested by the Jews for their Law, and shows that those of our Lord's time being by no means remarkable for strictness in observing the *moral* law, it must have been the *ceremonial* law for which they were so zealous: and, he proceeds:—

"If we ask why the Jews deemed of so much importance this conformity to their ceremonial law, we find that they believed themselves, by its observance, 'justified,' or rendered righteous in the sight of God, and put into possession of his peculiar favour. The conception of this state of privilege, again, had, in the time of Paul, assumed a peculiar form. The favour of God to his chosen people was to be manifested in the gift of Messiah; and hence 'justification' was to the Hebrew mind, identified with the being qualified for becoming subjects of Messiah, as soon as that expected personage should appear. This Messianic kingdom, it was believed, would be exclusively possessed by Jews; Messiah was to be the prince and deliverer of Israel alone; he was to expel the idolatrous Gentiles from the holy city; and to reduce them, in their turn, beneath the sway of the chosen people; and in all this anticipated glory and triumph, no Gentile, it was thought, could have any part—those only excepted, who had previously conformed to the Mosaic Law—or had, in fact, previously become Jews. 2. The cause of this exclusion of the Gentiles from the kingdom of the Messiah was the following: they were not possessed of the justification—obtainable only by ceremonial 'works of the law'—without which, according to Jewish notions, no one could be a subject of the Christ. Such justification it was, that gave the Jews, in their own apprehension, their title to be Messiah's subjects. This title the Gentiles did not, and without conforming to the Levitical Law *could not* possess. As Gentiles they were necessarily in a *state of sin* and condemnation, while the Jews were in a state of righteousness and acceptance (justification) through their 'works of the law.' The most upright and virtuous Heathen, would by the Hebrew have been deemed a 'sinner.'"—p. 21-22.

The case of Cornelius is dwelt upon in confirmation of this last assertion, and, Mr. Smith continues:—

"Here let me ask, when we find the Apostle Paul strenuously arguing that Justification (δικαιοσυνη, Rom. iii. 21, 22, 25) is not attainable by 'works of the law,' does he not mean the *same* thing which his countrymen, in his own time, meant by that word? He is manifestly opposing *their* prejudices, but if he does not mean by justification what *they* meant, what application can his arguments have to them? So we might ask

in reference to 'the works of the law' of which the Apostle speaks in his Epistles to the Galatians and the Romans."—p. 23.

Mr. Smith examines several texts, reputed strongholds of the doctrine of atonement, by the light of the above and similar principles, and proves, we think most satisfactorily that the meaning attached to them by Dr. Smith and the advocates for the doctrine of Atonement generally, is perfectly foreign to the signification which they could alone have borne to their readers: and we quite sympathize with the surprise which he expresses when he remarks; "how any theological scholar, who cannot but be well acquainted with all the facts which have been pointed out, can take texts out of those very passages in which Paul is arguing the subject of the Gentile controversy, and can assign a meaning to those texts, and found upon that meaning the most important doctrines, all the time without giving the remotest hint that that controversy has anything to do with the business of interpretation—how any theological scholar can thus act is, I must confess, entirely beyond my comprehension. Such a course, I submit, is precisely what Bishop Marsh meant, when he spoke of interpreting the Epistles of Paul, 'as if he were a writer of the *present age*.'"

Although, however, regarding Mr. Smith as absolutely triumphant in his overthrow of the opponent's argument, we cannot bring ourselves to acquiesce with equal confidence in the substituted hypothesis. As it is characterized by great ingenuity and may (we are not disposed to deny) have some important element of truth in it, we give his own explanation of it, somewhat at length.

"Jesus the Messiah was a Jew born 'under the law.' The law, therefore, forbade him from having friendly relations, in his character of Messiah, with any but Jews: as Peter said to Cornelius, 'Ye know how that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company with, or come unto, one of another nation.' So also Jesus himself, though in his parables and discourses he intimated that the Heathen nations were hereafter to be admitted into his kingdom equally with the Jews, yet during his own life, did not actually receive as subjects, the 'sinners of the Gentiles;' on the contrary, he declared to the Syro-Phœnician woman, 'I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the *house of Israel*.' The mortal person of the Messiah, then, was necessarily subject to the Levitical Law; it *did* belong exclusively to Jews; and hence none but Jews could legally become subjects to Messiah, while himself thus 'under the law.' Thus therefore had Jesus, Hebrew as he was, continued to live—had he remained (as the Jews had expected Messiah *would* remain*) for ever in his mortal life, the Gentiles must

* John xii. 34.

still and for ever have remained 'without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel,' to which alone the mortal Messiah belonged.

"But Providence, in its mercy, had ordained that the kingdom of Christ should be enlarged, so as to admit the whole human race; that Jesus should be the Messiah, not merely of the one small Jewish nation, but of all the nations of the world. In order to the accomplishment, however, of this great design, it was necessary that Jesus should cease to be what he was, a Jew born 'under the law,' and forbidden by the law (which he came not to destroy but to fulfil) to have any intercourse with those who were, legally, in a state of sin. And how was this to be effected? How, but by his *death?* The Apostle Paul writes, 'Know ye not, brethren, how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth?' implying, and indeed stating, immediately afterwards, that when the man is dead, the law has no longer dominion over him. Hence, therefore, by his death, Jesus became free from the bonds of the law.

"But still he had not yet attained his universal empire. This he did when he rose from the dead, and ascended to his throne in the heavens, there to rule over a new and spiritual kingdom, in which 'there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free;'—in which all national, local, personal distinctions are no more; and all men, without exception, may become children of God, by faith in Christ Jesus." . . . . "Christ therefore died to put himself, as it were, out of the jurisdiction of the law; so that all men, notwithstanding their state of legal condemnation and exclusion, might still become his subjects by believing, him in his risen and glorified state;" and thus be justified by faith.—pp. 30-32.

Now there is to us something unreal in all this. If it be meant as a solution for a difficulty merely existing in the Jewish mind in reference to the admission of the Gentiles, then it might have answered its purpose, as a piece of well-intentioned casuistry to satisfy the doubts of the Judaic Christians. But we collect from the tone of its advocacy by our Author, that he thinks the dilemma is real, and this to be a genuine and satisfactory plan of escaping from it. He speaks of the necessity that lay upon the Gentiles of continued exclusion from the Christian Church, had Christ continued in this mortal life:—he alludes with gratitude to his death, as a plan of Divine providence, for removing this difficulty. He says (p. 34), "It was, indeed, with the express design of breaking down the barrier, which, while he lived, kept off such persons from being his subjects that he died; that is to say, he 'died for' such persons—constituting, as they did, the whole Gentile world."

Now surely such a necessity, for such a purpose, is imaginary. Surely it cannot be supposed that Providence was, as it were, under the restriction contemplated—that the gentiles

could not have been admitted into Christ's kingdom, had it been millennial, or perpetuated for ages, without his death. This sounds to us very much like the reasoning of the opponent who says that God could not save the world without the satisfaction of Christ's death. This hypothesis seems in like manner to say that Providence could not save the gentiles without the liberation of them and of himself by Christ's death.

We cannot admit this hypothesis therefore as the explanation of a genuine *casus*, and if it be regarded merely as a mode of relieving the Jewish mind of a difficulty, then we cannot but think the sacrificial analogy sounder and truer—notwithstanding the passages referred to (p. 34), which certainly seem not unfavourable to the supposition Mr. Smith advances.

4. Of the last published of the works, placed at the head of this article—Dr. Carpenter's—we have not left ourselves room to speak as fully as we could desire. But it is the less necessary, as from the long and profound attention which the author is known to have devoted to the subject during his valuable life, and from the reverence with which his memory is cherished by so large a number of his fellow-christians, now that he is dead, we feel satisfied that the present posthumous work will be extensively read, without any lengthened recommendation of it from us. Dr. Carpenter's views on the subject of the Atonement have always been a matter of considerable interest, the more so, as they were very generally understood to be of a somewhat more affirmative character, than those usually entertained by Unitarians. He was thought to believe in a modified doctrine of Atonement, and not to be perfectly satisfied with the thorough rejection of it with which his Denomination was commonly charged. But this arose from his determined character as a Scripturalist. He would not give up Scripture language, and he was never satisfied until he had succeeded in attaching a clear, definite and genuine meaning to every passage of importance, which he encountered. He received everything that was taught as a doctrine in the Testament, and in the language in which it was taught. While others of his own denomination were content to omit the use of expressions which they regarded as indelibly associated with religious error and misapprehension, his anxiety was to clear the expressions of this misapprehension, and then employ them as a grateful believer in the doctrine which he thought they really contained. But when reduced to their ultimate positions, his views on the Atonement differed, we are inclined to think, in no important respect, from those of his co-religionists in general. He would reject the Doctrines of Satisfaction of Divine wrath in the Death

of Christ, Propitiation to his justice and injured Law, and the Vicarious punishment of our sins in the person of Christ, but he would not probably have objected to be called a believer in the Atonement, or reconciliation of man to God, through the medium of the life, death, teachings, sufferings, and resurrection of Jesus. He could therefore declare with perfect sincerity, as he does in these Lectures—

"That our Saviour suffered *for us*, for *our benefit*, is indisputable; it is what every Christian allows with cheerfulness and gratitude. That he suffered *for our sins*, or on account of our sins, no Christian can or does dispute. That he even suffered in our stead, is in one sense perfectly true; since through his sufferings he removes from his disciples those causes of present and future misery with which sin is inevitably attended; or in other words, by his sufferings he prevented ours."—p. 47.

Again;

"Feeling that I owe the possession of Gospel blessings, my hope of pardoning mercy and eternal life, to his obedience unto death, I hail him as (under God) my Saviour; his name, as associated with all his excellencies and all the blessings of the Gospel. is 'music to my ear;' and I join with delight and gratitude in the song,

"Worthy the Lamb that died, they cry,
To be exalted thus:
Worthy the Lamb, our lips reply,
For he was slain for us."

We might adduce many passages of a similar character; and it was these and such as these uttered from the Pulpit or issued from the Press, that induced many people to imagine that Dr. Carpenter approximated in some degree to the opinions of the orthodox on the death of Christ. But we imagine that they are in fact only so many proofs of the homage which he paid to the genuine worth and meaning of Scripture phrases, and that he used them, because he honestly believed that those phrases contained no meaning hostile to the opinions which he entertained, and he did not choose to be debarred from their use,—indeed, that in moments of high-wrought gratitude and religious fervour, he found none so suitable to give expression to the warm and impassioned feelings of his singularly devout and pious spirit.

That this was the whole secret of the matter, there is to us abundant evidence. The *residuum* of his opinions, expressed in his own language, was simply this—(a statement from which scarcely any of his own denomination would dissent):—

"To me it appears the plain, the simple fact, that Christ died because, in the appointment of Infinite Wisdom, he could not otherwise complete the work of salvation for which he came from God." . . . "It (his death) is a mode which is fitted to attract and interest the best sympathies of our nature, and to awaken the attention of those who would have passed by the religion of one who lived and died in ease and prosperity; it was eminently fitted to mature, perfect and exhibit the lovely and commanding graces of our Saviour's character, and to lead us to love and imitate; it was fitted to excite our gratitude for what he hath done for our best interests, and our disposition to obey; it served as a pledge of his own faith, and therefore as an assurance to us of the truth of what he taught: to show us how we should pass through the dark valley, and what we ought to fear more than death; and what is undoubtedly the great point of all, it was necessary to give security to our faith in the reality of his resurrection from the dead, and in his appointment to be our final Judge."—p. 136.

"The blood of Christ is nowhere represented as saving us, nor *does* it save us, except so far as through its spiritual influences in our hearts, and above all, through that Gospel which it assured and conveyed to us, it cleanses us from sin, and leads us to righteousness and true holiness."—p. 155.

"I shall rest satisfied with the simple intelligible doctrine—that all the efficacy of Christ's death is through *his word and work*; and that he who by the blessed *influences of the Gospel, is purified from his sins*, may well be said to be washed from them in the blood of Christ, that blood which assureth pardon and final acceptance to the penitent, sincere and faithful."—p. 174.

The Lectures before us, notwithstanding what we doubt not have been the care and judgment of the Editor, share in the disadvantages attached to posthumous publications. We do not mean in the want of finish and completeness, which must attach to writings which have not received the last corrections of the author, but in a certain want of unity and distinctness, which strikes us as being the deficiency of the volume. Perhaps under no circumstances could Lectures delivered at distant intervals, and forming parts of different courses, each no doubt with a particular modifying purpose of its own, be moulded into one consistent and uniform whole. We are informed in the Preface that the results of the author's "laborious study were presented in a popular form in a course of Lectures, delivered at Lewin's Mead Chapel in the year 1823, of which five were new and others were selected from his former writings," and that "another course was delivered in 1831, containing four additional lectures," and that it is from these fourteen lectures, composed as we have seen at different times, and on,

no doubt, slightly differing plans, that the present volume is compiled. No editorial labour can save a work of this kind from a certain degree of confusion. In the exposition of a very extended and very complicated subject, nothing is more necessary than an absolute unity of design. The several portions of the argument must be kept perfectly distinct; there must be no mixing of them up, and no repetition of ground once passed over; the reader must feel that in each lecture he has taken a step forward, and is so much, a certain definite degree, nearer his object than when he started. Another source of confusion to the general reader lies in the very candour of the author's mind, and the abundance of his materials. Dr. Carpenter was not a man to look at any question on one side. He would look all round it, before he made up his mind, gathering up with the most conscientious scrupulousness every fragment of the arguments bearing upon it. The Editor says, that the "notes in his possession cover twenty folio pages closely written in shorthand, containing an abstract of the works he consulted on the subject, and of his investigation into the ritual of the Jewish law, and other parts of the sacred Scriptures; and exhibit a mass of theological research which would astonish one who simply forms his opinion from the results, without having regard to the investigations by which those results have been obtained." And the fullness and exactness which characterized his investigations, accompanied his statements, and he never therefore could give that clear, penetrating impression of the cogency of his argument which a writer or preacher who only presents one phase of it, at a time, may often succeed in imparting. His learning suggests over-abundant material, and his candour prescribes the incessant parenthesis and qualification. The very qualities which we admire in the man and in the reasoner, and which make him all the more trustworthy as a guide, take off from the effective character of his statements when addressed to minds of more limited capacity, or inferior knowledge of the subject.

The argumentative strength of the volume before us consists in its *parts*; its moral strength pervades the whole. The thorough honesty and sincerity of the author's mind shine throughout it with an unquenchable light. You see that there is not in the whole of it a single trace of the special pleader. There is no contrivance, no trickery, no evasion. Every argument is met with the boldness of a man who has too much honesty to mislead others, and too much information to be misled by them. The perusal of it cannot but leave a most

favourable impression of the worth of the advocate, and the genuineness and beauty of his views, on the mind of every reader, even though he be opposed to him in religion. Dr. Carpenter has been sometimes thought to lay too great a stress on the separate words and phrases of Scripture, and to found more upon them than many Unitarians would now think justified by the nature of the several books of the Scripture, or the mode of their composition or compilation. But if he did so, it was from no timidity, but from entire conviction, and any one who desires to see how bold is his rejection of any portion of the received canon which he does not regard as possessed of apostolic or evangelical authority, will do well to consult the beginning of the Fourth Lecture on the authenticity of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which he entirely rejects. Indeed the Fourth Lecture as a whole seems to us the most successful in effect, from having the most simplicity and oneness in design.

C. W.

THE SCOTTISH ISLES.

Here, Nature, would I hold converse with thee
  Amidst thy solitudes immense and wild,
  Where rocks on rocks, fantastically piled,
Embraced for ever by the sounding sea.
Unceasing chorus raise; I love to be
  Near to thy naked majesty, beguiled
  Of anxious thought and care, and as a child,
Learn how thou workest when alone and free.

This heaving main, these rugged rocks were made
  For man, that here, enraptured, he might find,
If not a Home, a Temple, where, displayed,
  Wisdom and Power and Love appear combined,
And Grandeur where imagination quails,
And the big heart beats high, and utterance fails.

Art. VI.—A DISCOURSE ON THE CHARACTER AND WRITINGS OF REV. WILLIAM ELLERY CHANNING, D.D. By Orville Dewey, Pastor of the Church of the Messiah in New York. New York: 1843.

Our January Number of 1843 contained our tribute of reverence and sorrow to the memory of Channing; we are glad that in our anniversary Number of 1844 an occasion recalls us to a name that, to borrow from Dr. Dewey's text, should be held amongst us "in everlasting remembrance." Dr. Dewey was in Europe when his distinguished friend and countryman died. Prevented from joining with his brethren in the universal mourning, he offers this individual tribute, on the anniversary of his death. We missed at the time the forcible delineation and fervid utterance of one so sure to fix his eye at once on the simple elements of greatness in the friend he knew so well,—but it is better that, after the interval of a year, the subject should be restored to all its freshness by a master's hand, now that the first throb is over, and time has been given for the calm and final judgment to be formed. Dr. Dewey's Discourse is characterised accordingly by this mellowed ripeness of full and earnest, but unimpassioned feeling.

Dr. Dewey states that the mission and ministry of Channing "was to set forth the True, the Right, the Godlike; and to portray its loveliness and majesty." The Discourse traces the various forms this work assumed in his preaching, in his writings, in his conversation, and in his character. We shall follow Dr. Dewey through these several divisions of his great theme. Here is Dr. Channing's idea of Preaching:

"He did not think that a good sermon was a simple exhortation; that it was a bare repetition, however fervent, of truisms and common places; that it was enough to say to the people, 'be good.' He did not mistake, as some seem to do, the aged John's traditional saying in the Assembly, 'Dear children, love one another,' when he was too feeble to say any thing else; he did not mistake that for preaching. He did not listen to those who said, 'labour not the matter so much, the Gospel is a simple thing;' forgetting that it was a deep thing, too." *

"Preaching never seemed to him for an instant, the discharge of a mere professional duty, the fulfilment of a formal task. It was the great action of his life. He felt that never Demosthenes nor Cicero, that never Burke nor Chatham, had a greater work to do than he had on every Sunday. He poured into this office his whole mind and heart. The preparation for it was a work of consecrated genius: it was

as if, every week, he had made a poem or oration. No wonder that he often sank under it."

In speaking of Dr. Channing as a Controversialist we rejoice to find our view of his peculiar influence confirmed by Dr. Dewey.

"It was most fortunate, I think, that the great leader in this controversy should have been the fervent worshipper of the loveliness of religion, rather than an abstruse metaphysician, or a barren critic. And certainly, to my thought, religion was never invested with such a charm in this country, as in the glowing page and speech of Channing. I remember one of his hearers and parishioners saying, many years ago, 'Mr. Channing has a great idea of God!' How remarkably true, and how significant was the observation, all who have listened to him must be sensible. His idea of 'the Father' came nearer to that of the great Teacher, than that of any person I ever knew. And then the grandeur of the filial relation to Him,—the brotherhood of all men, and the glory of the spiritual man eclipsing all other glory,—what living themes were these in all his preaching, and in all his writings? I cannot doubt, and I have heard it admitted by those of other communions, that they have produced an effect upon the whole Theology, preaching, and religion of the country. That these central ideas often occur, and indeed are constantly repeated, in his writings, is not only undoubtedly true, but it is a peculiarity of which he was very well aware, and for which he had, as he conceived, a sufficient defence. It is so only, that the moral philosopher, the preacher of spiritual truth, can make an impression of himself upon the age in which he lives. Versatility should be the attribute of the dramatist, the essayist, the writer of fiction; but the strength, the significance of the Reformer, lies in concentration; the stamp of the Apostle is unity."—p. 18.

Dr. Channing's great power as a controversialist has always appeared to us to lie in this, that he spoke the word of God as it was revealed to him, in its purest forms, and so, filled the heart with its light and loveliness to the necessary exclusion of all unharmonizing views. His spirit of Freedom, his profound and lowly trust in Truth, his sympathy with Goodness, were the parents of his forms of belief; and the offspring did not kill the parent; the creed did not destroy the spirit of free thought from which it had been derived, but rather, sensible of its derived narrowness, of the necessary limitation of opinion, he reverenced individual Liberty as the perennial fountain, the teeming mother of all truth and progress.

It has been said that the first act of all true inquiry, as of all true worship, is the purification of the inquirer. Dr. Channing had purified his Mind from prejudice, self-interest, and fear, that

God's light might act purely,—come to him, in Bacon's phrase, as *dry light*, unbiassed and undamped by the acquired errors and partialities of our human will. It was this simplicity, this severe and faithful preparation of his mind that constituted the power of his conviction, and the greatness of his character. We never read a page of his writings without being reminded of the beautiful sentiment of the Apocryphal writer: "Wisdom entering into *holy* souls maketh them friends of God and prophets." He seemed to speak of his convictions as if they were no farther *his*, than that he had not interfered to obstruct them; that having purified himself and looked for light, presenting his unsoiled mind like a mirror, God had imaged such and such sentiments upon his soul. Hence was he so much of the *Prophet*, so little of the Doctor of Divinity. The Prophet renews, creates, touches afresh the springs of life: the Priest or the Minister gives an outward and conventional expression to traditionary feelings. Dr. Channing never could have been a mere commentator on other men's inspirations; an expounder, to crush out the fixed significance of texts. God had spoken to his own soul; he was a prophet himself; he had something to tell of his own inspirations. And this was the difference between him and ordinary men. Most of *us* speak as if Christianity was only an historical matter,—a thing to be read of and explained out of books, but not to be individually realised,—as if *there* was our source of inspiration, instead of with the living God. Dr. Channing thought the highest office of Christ and the Christian Scriptures was to bring him to the Father, *and to leave him there*;—that he too might feel the inspirations of a soul directly moved, and speak as one to whom God had spoken. Hence the life which he breathed into truths which we are all uttering. With him they were as God speaking through him,—with us they are entailed property, inherited possessions: we speak of them as if they were not our own. His was no traditional, historical faith: flesh and blood had not revealed it unto him,—he too had communed with God, and *his own soul* was Christian. And how simple are the elements of greatness,—truly believing, *knowing*, what all men are professing! He was so wonderful, because he taught the religion of Jesus Christ as if it was a reality. Alas, that the greatest, the most unrealised of all ideals, should still be Human Brotherhood, and the kingdom of God, the reign of a Father's spirit upon Earth!—and the divinest amongst men, he who speaks of these things as facts!

It was from this fulness of individual conviction that even his Sectarianism, that is, such peculiarities as belonged to his

conception of Christianity, always appeared in the direction of the aspirations of his mind,—and that he was controversial only with what interfered with the purity and perfection of the religious sentiment. If he argues against the tri-personality of God, it is because it confuses, and takes away the feeling of a spiritual Father. If he advocates Unitarianism, it is for the sake of unfolding "its tendencies to produce an elevated religious character." If he gives his peculiar views of the power of Christ, it is to preach his "Imitableness," and how intimately God may unite himself with each of us: so that whilst there is no man so powerfully controversial, there is no man so enriching, so little negative,—and in this respect all Unitarians must be of the same spirit and church with him, if they are to be a church at all.

Dr. Dewey speaks of Channing's writings on Slavery with some qualification as to the practical results in which he rested. We could wish that Dr. Dewey had been more explicit upon this matter. We are not aware that Dr. Channing ever dictated, or even proposed ways and means, or that he arrived at any practical result, except that Slavery is the worst wrong ever inflicted on human nature, and that, wherever it exists, it must be abolished at the very earliest moment which *consideration for the slave* permits. And to this practical sentiment Dr. Dewey gives the whole force of his own vehement utterance.

"Passing by all questions about the philosophy of the case, and the methods of relief, I cannot refuse to see, in his general conduct of this argument, a master's hand, a work throughout of unsurpassed strength and beauty. Never, anywhere, I think, have I more felt the power of Channing's mind and style, than in these writings. It seems as if the nerve of moral indignation had compressed and clenched his thought within the narrowest possible compass. The themes indeed were well-fitted to touch a mind like his. What a *man* is *worth*; what is the sanctity of a soul; what is the sacredness of a nature allied, affiliated to God; and what is the wrong of setting a human foot to crush down that nature; what is the wrong of bringing a mass of mere earthly conveniences and pleasures to extinguish that spark of heavenly fire, only that *they* may be brightened and warmed for a moment; what is the wrong of chaining an angel-nature to the plough that tills our fields, or to the chariot that rolls upon our high-ways; all this is set forth in burning words, which, when all this angry disputing shall be done, will stand as golden mottoes in the books of emancipated tribes and races of men. Yes; all this is true. I speak not of those who, involved in this relationship without their own agency, feel the tremendous moral solecism which it involves, and would gladly escape from it. But for the slaveholder, that defends his position as a lawful and righteous one, or means to hold on to it, right or wrong, because it is a matter of pro-

perty, I say, all this is true ; it is terrible truth ; it is truth too high for any mortal hand to beat down. Let men reason as they will ; let them defend, explain, qualify, soften the matter as they will ; my heart tells me that I was not made to be a slave, and I believe that every man's heart tells him the same thing. The slave-master's heart tells him that, and it would revolt at the supposition that any combination of circumstances, any leagued principalities and powers, though they were an hierarchy of angels, should crush out his nature's birth-right, by making him a slave. And if he will voluntarily inflict this condition upon another, I deem it not too solemn to remind him of a WORD that says, 'with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.'"—p. 23.

The most interesting part of this Discourse will be that which gives the impression of Dr. Channing which was received from personal intercourse with him.

"Intimacy with him, I may observe, was a rare thing ; and even where it existed, it was attended with restraints, not usual in the closest friendship. Where there was perfect freedom of *mind* in intercourse with him, there was not the perfect freedom of manner that ordinarily follows it. It has been said of Washington, that none of his military companions could freely lay their hand upon his shoulders. The same was true of Channing. He was a person of a delicate frame, but of a great presence. * ——

"Not, that he intended to make this impression ; for he sought and longed for a perfectly free communication ; and no conversation interested him more than that which, in forgetfulness of him, and of himself and of everything extraneous, was a kind of monologue, a kind of revery, the purest and most abstract idealism. Least of all must it be supposed that there was any assumption about him, or any stiff formality or precision ; anything that said, 'now let us talk a great talk.' Never. He did talk greatly, because he could not help it. But his manner of doing it, his manner in everything, was the most simple, the most unpretending imaginable. At the same time he possessed a nature the most truly social. He regretted anything in himself or in others, that repressed it. More than once has he said to me, 'I am *too serious*.' He longed to feel upon his spirit the free and genial breath of society. And all who have known him well, must have observed, for the last fifteen years of his life, the increasing liveliness, versatility and happiness of his social nature. The earliest days of his manhood were his darkest ; days of illness and seclusion. They spread around him a shadow of silence, and over many of his after-days, a shadow of reserve. But into that shadow every later year of his life seems to have poured new and more cheering light. * ——

"I wish it were in my power to give any idea of the extraordinary character of his conversation. On my first acquaintance with him it was my happiness to pass a number of weeks under his own roof. His health was then delicate ; he went abroad but little ; but his mind was

left untouched by the frailty of his body; and I found it constantly occupied and struggling with great questions. On the highest philosophy, on the highest religion, on the highest wisdom of life, all the day long he pursued the questions which these themes present, without ever slackening, or ever turning aside to ordinary or common-place talk. The range of his subjects was as great as their elevation; from the most recondite point in philosophy—the difference between relative and absolute truth—to the forms of philanthropic enterprise and political development around him. But his favourite themes were *Man* and the *New Testament*; Man, his condition and the philosophy of his condition; the New Testament, Jesus Christ, his teaching, and the sublimest contemplation of God. Sometimes his mind ran upon the same theme, almost without interruption, for an entire week; yet there was never any weariness in listening, but the weariness of exhaustion. * ——

"So lofty, so commanding was his thought, so did it soar above all around it, so deep was its impression, that a conversation with him *was often an event in life*; a high beacon that shed its light over the track of future years. I remember conversations with him, I remember single phrases, and the tone in which they were uttered, as having made upon me an impression beyond the effect of whole volumes of moral disquisition. If I were asked to convey an idea of this impression by repeating his words, the attempt were vain, because it would be impossible to give the manner and the tone. But those may imagine something of this, who remember the feeling awakened by his simple reading of a hymn; who recollect how to a dull and lifeless hymn, or to that which had been made so by ordinary repetition, he communicated a character altogether new; how it became, as it were, a new creation, beneath the breathing fervour of his touching emotion and utterance."—pp. 26-33.

Dr. Dewey bears testimony, in common with all who had personal intercourse with him, to the wonderful and most salutary impression produced by the tenderness of his heart in union with the severity of his Conscience:

"His was a goodness of heart the most gentle, tender and considerate. I do not believe that one unkind action can be found in his life. I never heard him utter a harsh and hasty word concerning any human being. But here I must still discriminate. In some respects he was a severe judge of men. Calmly and considerately his opinion was expressed; but it was strong and clear, and doubtless unsparing. He seemed at times a rigorous censor. Especially towards sensual aberrations he was so, and had some right to be, since he showed no indulgence towards himself. But his rigor was always tempered with pity. Informed on an occasion of a person who had fallen in this respect, 'Yes,' he said, 'I know that he has dishonoured himself;' with such a tone of rebuke and sorrow united, as I can never forget."—p. 37.

Another opportunity may not readily offer, and we have here a word to say of our own, on the writings of Channing in their relation to himself.

It is remarkable that there were two Periods in his religious History, very distinctly marked out in his successive writings; in the first of which he was engaged in the exclusive development of our spiritual relations to God,—and in the second of which this sense of Divine love manifested itself in his sympathy with humanity, as a fellow child with it of God. We do not mean that he was ever deficient in either of these two parts of a perfect religious spirit; but certainly in their last and perfect states they seemed to have in him a successive development. It was the sense of God as a Parent, that gave him a *Brother's* interest in all. He seemed to see all in their relations to God, before he felt his own relations to each; and we believe that this has always been the case wherever an intense, a self-sacrificing spirit of human Love has manifested itself. It has always spiritual roots, a religious source,—it acquires depth, enthusiasm, an undying Power, from a sense of connexion with God. This appears in History, and Christianity which first taught the parental relations of God, first introduced Missions of Mercy on behalf of Mankind,—a sense of the obligation of one portion of the human family to elevate the condition of another. And what earnestness and variety marked his labours in this second period when his sympathies were directed to human wants and sufferings! His sense of the one Parent, Friend, and Guardian of Humanity awoke his reverence for the moral nature in every man. Hence one who previously had been regarded as a man of thought alone,—of the closet, of retired and fastidious tastes, spoke to the toiling and working classes in tones the most earnest of the day,—vindicated the dignity and the spiritual offices of labour, and while he unfolded the capacities of true greatness in all, regarded the differences of outward life as the accidents of Condition. Hence his pleading for the slave, his demand in the name of the common Father that none of his children should be disfranchised of their natural rights,—his earnest sympathy with Manly Labour,—his desire to elevate that class,—his interest in the Ministry to the poor,—his persuasives to Self-Culture,—his warnings and entreaties against Intemperance. And here again all who profess his Faith, and would see it prosper, must act in his spirit,—and seek to make a Church among that class with whom he was willing to take his place as one of the brotherhood of humanity. We have here a large unworked quarry,—of the living Rock of human Nature. We must begin to act on the honest and good heart, strengthened with toil,—but yet unspoiled by false teaching. We do not say that it is the Duty of every man to originate, in his own person, an action on the working classes,—but it is his duty to

sympathize with such movements, to help them, and to look to them as a source of invigoration to the Christian Church, and of new strength and life to all generous principles. We know that good seed often produces unexpected harvests in a new soil.

And not towards the Poor and Toiling alone, but to all departments of human well-being he carried out his Christian principles. He would set all things right by the action of a Christian heart upon them. Wherever there was evil in Society or the State, there was something for the spirit of God, the spirit of Goodness to subdue: and the Evil Spirits he wrestled with were not the visionary Satans of Theology, but the Devils that corrupt men's hearts, darken their souls, and enslave their moral Liberty,—Sin, Ignorance, Passion, Oppression. Evil in high places was as sure to hear his Rebuke,—as our common humanity in its lowest estate to attract his sympathy.

And this sense that he had of an independent power, and responsibility in every man, gave him a rare reverence for the liberty of the individual mind. No man was more willing to submit to the inconveniencies of Freedom. He did not demand agreement with himself,—he gave his sanction to men with whose results of plan and opinion he had no sympathy, only because he reverenced the spirit of individual inquiry and responsibility from which they had proceeded. He was not afraid of the agitations of Liberty. He knew that you cannot combine the quiet of despotism and the vitality of Freedom,—the uniformity of Authority and the quickening impulses of individual thought. In this respect we who belong to the same Denomination must take him as an example, and regard the men who stir our thoughts and impulses, as the salt of the Earth that keep our souls from rotting.

And how shall we honour his Memory? how show that he was as a Master amongst us? Surely not by aspiring to those Powers which God gives to few, but by faithfully working out those Principles and Sentiments, that Faith, the sense of which he awakened in us all. And though no one remains like him to take his place,—yet wisdom is justified of all her children; and if we are faithful we may by our fidelity to a right spirit, be rendering the hearts of men better prepared for the appearance of a true Prophet of God, when our Father sees fit to grant *another* to the world. By our combined fidelity, by the aggregate of our influences, we must do the work of one great Spirit,—till God gives another Leader, who by the divine right of a heavenly power over our hearts, may be reverenced as a spiritual father amongst us.

And this reminds us that Dr. Dewey has expressed all this better than we can do. We give his closing passage, with the omission of a clause in its first sentence, infected with that false taste from which the very best American writers are not free,—from which Channing himself did not at all times escape.

"When he fell in the conflict, when he died, * —what was the feeling that burst forth in the places that knew him—in the entire country that venerated him? No conqueror's wreath should be taken in exchange by me, for that simple feeling. The whole country felt, all sectional and sectarian prejudices forgotten, that a great man was fallen; that one who sat higher than in seats of office, had fallen; that a light which shone long time in our firmament, purely and brightly, was gone down; and that the land was left darker for its mournful departure. And those who knew him and loved him looked on aghast, scarce receiving what they heard; scarce believing what they saw, deeming it strange, if possible, that such a one should be dead! I know not but I am uttering what is more personal than I ought to suppose to prevail far; but I am tempted to say was there ever a feeling so singular, so peculiar, so sad and wondering, as that which we have felt about the death of Channing? as if his life were a part of our daily light, and *could* not cease to shine upon us! as if his wisdom was a part of our daily food, and *could* not so fail us! as if his influence upon us had become one of the fixed ordinances of our being, and could never pass away!

"Oh! in that feeling methinks there is an augury and an oracle. He *is* not dead to us, nor we to him. His words are still in our ears. We still walk in his light, though sorrowing now for a while—sorrowing most of all, that we shall see his face no more!"—p. 40.

Art. VII.—NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

I. A Prayer Bell for the Universal Church. By Walter C. Perry.

This is a valuable and beautiful aid to devotional meditation. It consists of brief Reflections preparatory to Morning and Evening Prayer, and Addresses intended for Partakers of the Holy Communion. The Reflections are in number Fifteen, one for each morning and evening in the week, and an additional one to be used in seasons of affliction. Each is headed by a few lines of sacred poetry from Watts, Montgomery, Hemans and others, and by a few impressive and well-selected verses from Scripture. The only way to test the value of such a book as this is to *use it*. To look it through in a day is to do it no justice, because an interval is necessarily required between the reading of the several portions of it, to allow of the feelings recurring to a state suitable to the purposes intended to be promoted by it. But even from such a perusal as this we rise with a most favourable impression of the volume. The Reflections are striking in expression, and devotional in spirit. They appear to us so equably-sustained, that the transfer of any one entire to our pages, would, could we assign so much room to the purpose, give the truest and best impression of their worth. We select a passage or two from the Reflection for Sunday Morning; as the most distinctive in its character.

"By the blessing of God we have been permitted to see another Sabbath; and if we think and feel rightly we cannot greet this day without emotion. It is the day of *rest*. And if it were nothing more than this, it ought still to be holy in our eyes, for the blessed influence it exerts upon mankind, and especially on the toil-worn poor. On this day of all the seven, 'the earth is at rest and is quiet.' The struggling, toiling and contending millions have ceased to struggle and contend, relieved, as it were, by the hand of God Himself, from the penalty of Adam, from the burdens of Mammon, the insatiable taskmaster. What but a sense of religion, what but an ordinance of God, could have wrung from the hands of the rich and powerful so great a boon to those who toil for them as this? Were it nothing more, then, than a day of rest, it were a hallowed and a blessed day to all who have gained by labour the luxury of repose."

"During the week that is past, we have worshipped together as a family, we trust, in unity and godly love. And when on this sacred day we join with the members of the great household of faith in the more public and solemn services of religion, we should be able to greet them with the same kindly dispositions which we feel towards one another; not only giving the name, but cherishing the confidence and the love of Brethren, towards all who seek to do our heavenly Father's will. If in such a frame of mind we seek the Lord in the temples we consecrate to Him, 'our prayer shall return' with a blessing 'to our own bosoms,' and we shall find favour in the sight of him who hath declared that 'wherever two or three are met together in his name, he is there in the midst of them.'"

Of the Sacramental Addresses, there are five—three before, and two after Communion. The first is "on the origin of the rite called the Lord's Supper," and is historical in its character—the rest are practical and devotional. No doubt the Author has used them in his own ministrations, and we think that many of his Brethren might find variety and satisfaction in the adoption of some thoughts suggested by them, in their own celebration of the same service.

We take the following passage from the second address:—

"He can have but little knowledge of the necessities of his own or others' hearts, who looks with indifference on the long-established customs of religion in general, and more especially on that holy commemorative right which we, with far other feelings, we trust, propose this day to celebrate. He has but little right feeling or true philosophy, in whose mind the question, 'what good will it do me?' perpetually arises, when he is invited to join with his fellows in the services of Religion. By the constant repetition of such a query, a man may soon reason himself out of almost everything which is really and truly *good*. 'Of what good,' he may say, 'of what good is it to me to read in Holy Scripture that which is already so familiar to me? of what good to join in prayer for blessings to Him whose ways are immutable? of what good to hear principles and truths expounded of which I am already persuaded?' and 'of what good is it,' he might say, 'to mourn over the Saviour's sufferings and death, or to eat and drink the symbols of his body? they are but bread and wine; to eat of them is no merit in the sight of God, and we no longer believe that their taste can confer immortality.' And thus, 'the scorner seeketh wisdom and findeth it not;' this is the way which 'seemeth right to a man, but the end thereof is death.' Great, doubtless, are the evils attendant on unreasoning faith; numerous and destructive are the errors into which superstition leads men; but let us be assured that there is no more fatal error than that of bringing every thing to the test of mere utility—no evils greater than those which arise from regulating every movement of the heart by a calculation of profits. Superstition may obscure and

distort our view of spiritual things, but a too eager chase after immediate advantage will carry us away from God and Heaven altogether."

And then, after referring to the confidence of the disciples in their unswerving attachment to their Master and to Truth, and to their being scattered every man to his own and leaving him alone, the Address proceeds—

"And though *we believe*, is there no danger that we too should 'be scattered every man to *his own*?'—that our hearts should be turned from God to the pursuit of selfish interests, and to the gratification of mean desires? Do we find, as a matter of fact, that the mere knowledge of what is right, the mere assent of the intellect and the judgment to the truth of Jesus' words, is sufficient to keep us in the path of life, and guide us to our distant home? Or can it be said, with any truth, that if this faith and knowledge be not sufficient of themselves, all aids to them are vain. We are so much the creatures of circumstance; our feelings and actions, at any particular moment, take their colour and their character so much from present influences; our hearts are so chameleon-like in their changeful hues, that it were the height of folly to be careless of the influences to which they are habitually subject, to neglect to place them in the brightest sunshine, and expose them to the purest breeze." . . . . . "If we watch the career of the good and great, we shall not find that they are, as it were, machines which are kept in uniform and steady motion by the force of heavenly principles, but that they too have had their periods of wandering and slumber; that like the stars which shine upon this lower world, they do not always yield their light, but are often hidden from our eyes by clouds. Let us not, then, forsake," &c.

We have been so much pleased with the execution of this little book, that we were near forgetting to express our entire dissent from the principle which the Author lays down in his Preface, and in reference to which he seems to have composed the Reflections. He thinks that Family Prayer as usually conducted is only an influence leading to the desire of Prayer, rather than Prayer itself. And "it is intended that the Reflections should be read aloud, and that at their close, the members of the family, assuming their usual attitude of prayer, should devote a period of silence to communion with Him, who knoweth the hearts of His children with their various weaknesses and wants." The objections to the plan proposed are, we think, obvious. Family Prayer is an act of *social* worship. This would make it an act of personal worship. Personal prayer is all-important, and should not be neglected, and it is for the encouragement of such a habit in the young, that such books of devotion as Mr. Wellbeloved's and Miss Martineau's, (containing both the prepara-

tion for prayer and prayer itself,) have been published. But Family Prayer is a distinct thing, designed at once as the guide and the expression of the common feelings of religion, to be entertained by members of the same household. Individual prayer is best conducted in the closet; family prayer in the room of general meeting of a household, and public prayer in the house of the congregation. The Author's idea, in no way, however, affects the worth or usefulness of his volume. It may still be adopted in Families, either on the Author's own plan, or by the addition of a short suitable prayer from another source.

II. An active an enlightened Laity essential to the prosperity of the Christian Church. A Discourse on occasion of the death of George William Wood, Esq., M.P. By John James Tayler, B.A. With the services at the interment, and a sketch of his Character. London: 1843.

The Laity, an immense majority when compared with the professional teachers of Religion, *is* the Christian Church; but even the peculiar offices of its Ministers cannot be efficiently and successfully performed without the sympathy, co-operation, and support of pious and enlightened laymen. The Presbyterian Congregations, and their modern successors, lived and live, in a strange ignorance of this truth. Not indeed that there may not be found laymen disposed even to an exaggeration of their importance in their individual churches,—but that there is everywhere throughout the English Presbyterian, or Unitarian Denomination a total absence of any organization through which the members of the same congregation may associate together for benevolent action, draw one another into close connection with the various institutions of Christian usefulness that spring from its bosom, and collect the effective sympathies and aid of each family and individual it contains upon every practical arrangement relating to its temporal or spiritual interests. The absence of all such organization is one of the principal sources of our weakness as a religious Body. Men require a more living connection with the Church of Christ than that of mere listeners. Even in their relations to a Congregation they must be "doers of the word not hearers only," if they are to be held very closely to it by that sense of moral satisfaction which is the strongest ligament, and which an actual participation in Christian action can alone afford. Our Author once prepared a plan for the internal organization of individual Congregations, with a

view towards their most perfect union for carrying out, by spiritual and material means, the various objects of a truly Christian Church. He could not better serve his Denomination, than by again taking counsel with his brethren, and securing for his ideas a working form and a practical acceptance. No man will estimate more justly the high and Christian purposes for which such organization should exist, or see more clearly, so as to avoid, the possible dangers with which it might be attended. The spirit in which Mr. Tayler would devise such a scheme may be judged of, from the following passage :—

"Religion is rather the central interest of humanity, which should dwell in the very midst of our daily employments, and engage the affections and occupy the thoughts of all men :—and the Church will then only fulfil its proper object, as a free association of rational and responsible beings, for the joint exercise and cultivation of their purest affections and noblest tendencies, when the distinction between layman and minister shall be considered as only one of momentary convenience, when its members shall feel they have all an equal interest and share in its offices and ministrations, and in different ways, according to their several gifts, shall work together in extending its operations upon the hearts and lives of men, and by making its salutary influences felt through the varied relationships of social life, save it from the contempt and abandonment inevitably awaiting every institution that stands aloof from the great universal interests of humanity.

"The importance of lay agency in the affairs of the Church cannot be too highly estimated, and the present course of events in this country must tend to make all thoughtful minds more aware of it. Laymen themselves, then, must understand their duties, and acquire the prerequisites for discharging them well. Men prepare themselves by reading and reflexion for taking an intelligent part in politics ; and the same preparation ought not to be neglected for filling their stations in the Church with benefit to the world. Religion and politics are the two grand interests of life, on which far more than on the mere accumulation of material wealth, the progressive well-being and happiness of mankind repose : and in an age where so much depends on the right disposal of the questions that grow out of these two great interests—every man should feel it his duty to qualify himself for acting wisely and consistently in respect to them. Otherwise, with the best intentions, unenlightened zeal and defective knowledge may injure the cause they have intended to serve."—p. 13.

Mr. Tayler has not sketched, in any detail, the functions of a layman within the Christian Church, though he has admirably indicated the kind of service he might perform. Except where religious rights and civil institutions come into collision, and present a sphere of service in which an enlightened layman is called upon to defend by argument, and maintain in action, the

great principles of spiritual liberty, the question of the functions of laymen must be confined to their influence upon the religious life and the benevolent institutions of their respective associations for Christian worship and beneficence, for it is only within these limits that the distinction between layman and minister can at all be recognised.

The manner in which laymen may best unite to render a Christian Congregation, not merely isolated listeners to prayer and preaching, but a living centre of Christian philanthropy, the creator and supporter of charitable, educational, and missionary Institutions, is a question that invites the attention of pious and thoughtful men beyond all others that concern the visible Church of Christ.

Mr. Tayler's remarks upon this subject are introductory to the high commendation which he justly bestows upon Mr. Wood in these relations, and indeed serve as an indirect delineation of his Character. The more detailed sketch of Mr. Wood both in the Sermon and in the Appendix may hereafter be a model, on those rare occasions, when it is proper for the Minister of religion to speak in the house of prayer and Christian aspiration of any individual, whether for praise or blame. That there are such occasions we readily admit, and that this was one of them. The death of a fellow-worshipper is an occasion to be approached with peculiar delicacy. Private sorrow is a sacred thing, and in its presence the attention of the stranger ought seldom indeed to be invited either to the grief of the living, or the character of the dead. In the pulpit the Christian Minister can exhibit no standard of character but one; can uphold the virtues of no other as a model, and would not draw notice on their frailties. There Christian goodness refuses to be measured by individuals, and Christian consolation discourses of the destinies of our nature and of the providence of our God, and the mourner finds that his individual sorrow is embraced within the comfort of these universal views, and that the thoughts which strengthen are more firmly based, because they proceed from a large consideration of God's great plan, and detached from the peculiarities of single cases. These impressions disincline us, as a general rule, to what are called "Funeral Sermons," and we wonder that religious sacredness and lacerated feeling have not long since united, and demanded their suppression, as they are commonly perpetrated. Let private sorrow ever meet that respectful sympathy which directs the train of thought and reflection to topics that accord with its wants,—but in the open church let no private heart be intruded on, no bereaved affection hear its sacred object made a public theme. The exceptions to this rule are in the

few cases in which the character of an individual eminent above his fellows, and occupying a conspicuous place, is already the property of the public, and every mind feels afflicted as by a private loss, or where he is so associated with all the interests of a congregation that he has an established connexion with all the local sympathies of their weekly worship. Under either head of this exception, the death of Mr. George William Wood was an occasion on which to break the silence of the church, and speak of individual worth and service. Never was the delicate office performed with a more admirable union of tenderness and truth. The only danger is lest the perfect success with which Mr. Tayler can execute such a task, should induce inferior men to attempt similar delineations,—and then most grievous would be the failure, and harsh the grating.

His description of Mr. Wood's doctrinal belief is a delineation not so much of an individual, as of a large class once embracing the whole Unitarian body ; and there may still be some who will not readily conceive what idea Mr. Tayler attaches to religious *faith*, except that of an earnest belief in the truth of certain doctrinal statements. Yet the *trust* of the soul in all the higher sentiments, in the goodness and perfection of God, and in the aspiration after the greatness and loveliness of Christ, as the right practical guidance of life, is the only sense in which St. Paul uses the expression. We extract the passage because, as we have said, it is descriptive of a class.

"His doctrinal belief was clearly and decidedly Unitarian, derived from considerable reading and reflection on the subject, and strengthened by his habitual intercourse with the most eminent expounders of the Unitarian system in the present and the past generations, Belsham, Carpenter, and Wellbeloved. Perhaps to younger men, whose minds were more intent on the future than on the past, his views might seem occasionally to be marked by some of the deficiencies, and that want of strict consequentiality, which they conceive to attach to the earlier statements of the Unitarian doctrine. His mind was remarkably practical, and very tenacious of opinions once adopted. He was therefore averse from all speculations which tended to unsettle principles which he supposed had been already established. Perhaps also he erred with many Unitarians of the last generation in regarding Christianity, and Unitarianism as the truest expression of it—in too intellectual and doctrinal a light—too much as a definite system of religious philosophy —and not as a broad and popular principle of deep and earnest faith, and warm sympathy with universal humanity, intended rather to quicken and spiritualize the affections and the conscience, than to fashion the philosophical conceptions of the understanding. His own native sympathies were ardent and generous, and he could duly appreciate popular efforts to disseminate education and religion among the masses of the community. But the aristocratical bias of his mind led him to cling to

precedent and established usages; and the general cast of his religious opinions would have been considered rather intellectual and systematic than spiritual. In this, however, he only expressed the image of the time and the community in which his earliest impressions had been received."—p. 21.

In the closing passages of the Discourse in which Mr. Tayler is led to speak of personal relations and feelings, there is a noble simplicity,—wisdom, tenderness, and beauty, speaking with one voice.

"Events sometimes occur, like the sudden stroke of a clock in the stillness of night, announcing to the startled spirit the unsuspected hour of our swiftly passing existence. That voice of solemn warning comes to me, when I think of the grave so recently closed; and the train of memory it awakens is of a mingled hue. I call to mind with lively gratitude the many instances of wise and faithful counsel, the many proofs of kind interest and cordial regard, which through long years and changing circumstances I continued to experience from our friend now gone. There were a few things, too, which it may be less pleasing to recollect. In the passage of life, perhaps no earnest and sincere minds can escape partial collisions. They cannot be true to themselves, without temporary offence to each other. Nor is any situation more painful than that in which conviction of the right and the strong feelings of friendship, draw for the moment in opposite directions. There were a few occasions in the years now passed away, in which an imagined sense of duty—perhaps mistaken—perhaps exaggerated—forced me into opposition to the views and wishes of my friend: but in this moment of sad and softened remembrance, I can only regard it as one of the many excellencies of his generous nature, that, when the earliest emotions of irritated feeling were over and gone, no sentiment of ill-will ever harboured in his breast, and the expressions of his friendship remained as hearty and genial as before. I now recal the good and noble qualities, which some haughtiness of manner, combined with my own infirmities, may have tempted me occasionally to lose sight of or undervalue; and it is with tears of grateful affection that I moisten his grave. My friends will forgive this expression of personal feeling. It comes unbidden to my lips. Those of them who have had as constant intercourse with the departed, will sympathise with all that I have said; they will do justice to his many virtues, and deplore the human weaknesses that ever caused them for a moment to be overshadowed or forgotten.

"Friends and fellow-mourners, let not this life of honourable activity have passed away from us in vain. Let us seriously reflect, how much it has left for us to perform. Sobered by the experience of life and warned of its uncertainty—let us with clearer views, with calmer judgments, and with steadier aims, follow in the footsteps of all the honoured and virtuous dead—not servilely copying their acts, where we believe they were mistaken, nor implicitly adopting their principles, where we perceive they were defective; but let us imbibe the generous *spirit* of

their characters, and in the honest application of our own ripened judgments and enlarged experience to the rising circumstances of the world, let us emulate them in the love of truth and freedom—in sustained and thoughtful efforts to serve the best interests of our country and our kind."

III. The Supremacy of the One God the Father, Vindicated. By the Rev. John Harrison, Ph. D. London: 1843.

This is one of those Vindications of Unitarianism which are called forth by local circumstances, and which are often more eminently useful in the neighbourhood of their birth, than more complete and elaborate treatises which have no immediate application, and enter into no personal struggle with actual opponents. A clear, direct, and convincing answer to some confident argument that has just been poured into your ears by a living man, is a much more forcible and conclusive instrument, than the same answer in a learned treatise to an argument that nobody had been urging. And in fact, the arguments that have to be employed by Unitarians, are too much of this nature,—arguments that nobody would ever dream of advancing, were it not that Trinitarianism must be met on its own ground; and some of its reasonings are of a nature that replies to them, however convincing, can have no profit. It is this which makes the controversy so wearisome: the great warfare is carried on with instruments so utterly contemptible, and on ground so worthless, that it may be lost or won, and leave the parties where they were.

A work of this kind, intended as a ready answer to the statements or reasonings of some very ordinary writer, cannot be complete; its completeness would spoil it for its immediate purpose,—enough if it is fresh, competently learned, and written in a Christian spirit. All this we can most cordially say of the little treatise before us. It is remarkably cheap, and well fitted to do good service in its day and place. And men who are content to write and publish works addressed to an immediate and pressing occasion, and which *must* therefore have but a temporary interest, are entitled to especial praise for their self-sacrifice, and disinterested zeal for the truth.

An instance of the *reductio ad absurdum* applied to the Trinitarian *method* of proof is ingenious. Whether new or not we cannot say, for our memory does not long retain these things. It might be advantageous to have one or two such examples ready for use.

"In Luke ii. 22, it is said, 'And when the days of her purification, according *to the law of Moses*, were accomplished.' But in the 39th verse it is said, 'And when they had performed these things according to *the law of the Lord*.' Now as the Evangelist calls the Law of *Moses*, the Law of the *Lord*, what is the conclusion? Why that Moses *is* the Lord.

"In Deut. xxxix. 5, it is said, '*I Moses* have led you forty years in the wilderness.' In Deut. viii. 2; xxxii. 12, it is said, 'The *Lord thy God* led thee forty years in the wilderness.' 'The Lord *alone* did lead him.'"

Why should not the Trinity become a Quaternity? It would not *stop* there, indeed, if this *method of proof* were consistently applied.

IV. The Authority of Scripture, with respect to addressing prayer and worship to the Lord Jesus Christ. By Herman Heinfetter. London: 1843.

The object of this inquiry is to ascertain the doctrine and practice of the Scriptures respecting the use of Prayer and Worship towards our Lord Jesus Christ. It is comprised in three Sections.

I. What are the direct commands on this subject in the Scriptures?

II. What were the Practices, Allusions, and Statements of the Apostles on the subject?

III. What are the instructions on this subject contained in the Benedictions used by the Apostles and others?

The work is a thorough examination of the Scripture Evidence on this question. It is written with piety, calmness, and learning, and conveys the impression that the Author is not defending a position, but seeking the Truth. He arrives at these conclusions:—

1. That it is commanded not to pray to our Lord.

2. That we have no instance in Scripture of man's addressing Prayer, Praise, or Thanksgiving to our Lord, after his ascension.

3. That on three occasions after the Resurrection, it is recorded that man *spoke* to our Lord.

4. That men are often said to have worshipped our Lord, but never except when personally present with them.

5. That in many passages the Apostles wish men the enjoyment of blessings from the Lord; and admonish them to refer the glory of their spiritual improvement to the Lord.

Mr. Heinfetter's definition of Prayer may be objected to,—

but rather by the Unitarian than the Trinitarian Controversialist.

"It is not the nature of the request that constitutes Prayer, but the circumstances under which the request is made; the smallest request made of a Being, not present to any of our senses, is, equally with the largest, Prayer. The absence of the Being to Man's Senses, of whom the request is made, is, in my opinion, the sole requisite to constitute Prayer."—vii.

In Philippians ii. 9-11, our Author corrects the translation and reforms the sense, by omitting the conjunction *that*, in the eleventh verse. "God hath given him a name that is above every name, that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

Mr. Heinfetter calls the omitted '*that*,' the Demonstrative Pronoun. The demonstrative pronoun may be its origin, but it is here a conjunction,—and to call a conjunction a pronoun is a misuse of etymology.

V. The Tests of Time: A Story of Social Life. By Sara Wood. London: 1843.

A very agreeable Tale. Those who can read it without some new wisdom, and some new tears, must be wiser or colder than we have proved to be.

We object to the conclusion. A story should be a work of Art, and have a natural close. The Author might as well have stopped any where else, as where she has. We once heard an invalid sufferer from an interminable sermon, *without a plan*, exclaim with mock thankfulness, and bitter contempt, 'It was very kind of the gentleman to stop at all: there was no reason why he should.' Not so with our Author; she had a plan, has ample powers to give symmetry and unity to her Tale, and must have adopted some wrong principles in Fiction.

VI. A Discourse, preached before the Second Church in Boston, in commemoration of the Life and Character of their former Pastor, Rev. Henry Ware, jun., D.D. By Chandler Robbins. Boston: 1843.

This is an affectionate, and we doubt not a conscientious tribute to the memory of one, who well deserved that it should be paid

him. "Star after star departs;" and within how short a time have we seen the setting of "Arcturus with his sons!" Channing and Carpenter, Tuckerman, Follen, and Greenwood, how fast have they followed each other to the spirit-land! And now another is gone—Henry Ware is with the departed and undying. How rich we *were!* we exclaim, when we sum up our losses. And how rich we *are,* when we think upon what they have left us—their memories and their examples, their surviving thoughts and their imperishable labours! But our present business is solely with "the last of that bright band." We have to say over his fresh grave a few words of truth and love.

All we have heard or read of this excellent man has convinced us that he was one of those men who have fully understood their mission, and done justice to their gifts of talent and opportunity. There was no jarring earthly voice within, to mar the distinctness with which he heard the call of Heaven. He took the sacred office upon him, because he believed it the highest and happiest of all human vocations. He chose the Ministry of Christianity, not as a mere profession, not as a means of obtaining a livelihood and fixing a position in society, but because he felt it the occupation which answered to the pure ambitions and aspirations of his soul, and which promised his whole nature that full and ennobling employment, without which even *he* would have been unquiet and unhappy. Heart and hand, mind and soul, acquiesced in the profession that he had chosen. Hence arose, in the first place, that repose and serenity of temper which, so far from interfering with high and energetic action, does in fact importantly assist it, by removing many inward obstructions. This sweetness and evenness of temper seems to have made a vivid impression upon all who knew him. It was deeply seated, and never forsook him. There was no undercurrent of baffled and irritating feeling, to ruffle the surface, or to counterwork the force of the gracious impulses that swayed him. Hence arose also the consistency and *wholeness* of his life. He was not one thing, wishing to be another. He had no lookings-back, after laying his hand upon the plough. His life was not made up of parts and fragments, which might have belonged to different men, as they indicated the vacillations of an unsettled spirit, and the succession of wayward and thwarting desires. His whole being found full and rich occupation in that Ministry to which he gave himself up, to be his "early visitation and his last." Hence, too, arose the uniform and steady happiness, which that Ministry procured him. It filled his heart to the brim. It answered to all the calls, to all the needs, of his pure being. He was *happy* in it, in the noblest sense in which we can apply that word to the life of a mortal.

He enjoyed that "sober certainty of waking bliss," which can only arise from such a rare accordancy of the path of life chosen with the powers, wishes, and aims of him who makes the choice. The call from within was *unanimous;* and in obeying it, he found that the life of his first and deliberate choice was the one, of all others, in which his pure and unselfish spirit could most freely develope itself, and reap its only appropriate rewards.

Dr. Ware's Works are well known in England, where many of them have obtained a high degree of popularity. Written with a sincere desire to do good, they have done, and are doing much to realise the pure aim of their author. His work on the Formation of the Christian Character was valued by the late Dr. Carpenter as one of the most precious contributions to the religious literature of the age. It should be a closet favourite with all who desire to do good to their own souls. Others of Dr. Ware's writings have been circulated largely in this country; but of these, with the exception of his Recollections of Jotham Anderson, we have not, personally, the same right to give an opinion. From time to time he varied the form rather than the spirit of his occupations, by casting his thoughts into the mould of verse. One of these compositions (the beautiful lyric, "To prayer, to prayer!") may be considered as a standard addition to the devotional literature of the two countries. It contains some unequal lines, but is distinguished, as a whole, by the fervency and force of the devout emotions it expresses, and its power of transferring them livingly and stirringly to the heart. One such work as Dr. Ware's on the Formation of the Christian Character, and one such fervid hymn as that to which we have just alluded, are enough (if he had done nothing else) to keep the grass from his haunts and the moss from his name.

But these were only a part, and a small part, of his labours. The funeral notice of Mr. Robbins gives a list of his literary productions, which shows that his private hours were not passed in intellectual sloth. His study was a constant scene of dutiful and elegant industry. His *writings*, however, admit of enumeration;—but his *other* various exertions can be estimated only by those who were successively or simultaneously the objects of them, for whose benefit they were undertaken, and in whose grateful recollections they have their only fame. Dr. Ware appears to have been only chargeable with the generous error of doing too much. He overdrew his accounts, and spent himself before his time. This we think *an error*, with whatever epithet we may soften or embellish it. Those, who live to care for others, should, even for *their* sakes, be careful of themselves. Surely there is a mean, between doing too much

and too little. We grudge the over-efforts, that cost us the early loss of the good, the gifted, and the guiding. We cannot afford to lose so many sunbeams at noon: we cannot think it necessary that so many of our confessors should be martyrs.

The power of a fine Christian Character, when placed in a situation to do itself any justice, is as great as it is interesting. A stranger has gone to his rest on the other side of the ocean—in most cases, a very unaffecting event. What has occasioned the deep interest with which we heard of it in this? That stranger, if we may term him such, was Henry Ware. He was a man whose soul was not to be bounded by the ocean, and whose heart made a country wherever it came. His was the golden faith that wrought by love; and the love that he had won was condensed, at the tidings of his death, into one wide sorrow. That sorrow was not wholly unselfish; and yet we felt it happy that the stroke was no longer deferred. There appear to have been morbid causes at work upon his physical structure, which might have been productive of much suffering, both to himself and to others. We are glad that the star has set in its brightness, or has only been gently dimmed by the mists of the horizon. What a Heaven it will be in which all these lights will re-appear! The Southern Cross is a poor and pale emblem of the lights that will gather into the Glory-Cross of the Christian Heaven.

We return to the Funeral Address, from which we have too long detained the reader. There are some things in it which we do not like—some paragraphs and portions of paragraphs, which seem too calculated for immediate effect to be, in an equal degree, distantly and finally effective. Some figures, which strike us as injudicious, we silently drop from the passages in which they occur, and find these passages lightened and brightened by their removal. But from any thing like stricture we turn, and gladly turn, to extract a few portions of the discourse, which, while they exhibit the preacher to unquestioned advantage, suggest a fine Idea of the Character of his lamented Friend.

Drawing up these rapid remarks at the close of another year for a Periodical which is to appear on the first day of the new one, we doubt not that the following passage will be thought no less appropriate to the season, than it is impressive in itself, and valuable for the suggestions it contains. We have deep faith in the efficacy of these seasonable exhortations; and we have here one more strong precedent in their favour—the practice of another exemplary pulpit, and the voice of another honoured and holy grave.

"He did not, on this occasion, allude to another service of his own institution—of which, however, he has more frequently spoken, and to which he has repeatedly shown his attachment, by returning to its celebration, since it has come into other hands. I allude to the Lecture at the Close of the Year; a sacred and affecting occasion; which has always been associated with his image, and will be, henceforth, still more intimately—an occasion which I hope may be solemnly kept by our children, when we, like him, shall be safe from the wear and injury of years—an occasion which I pray may never become obsolete in the Second Church, so long as it has a name amongst the members of Christ. Mr. Ware was peculiarly qualified to do justice to a service like this. His feelings were alive to all the solemn and elevating influences of the hour. His spirit easily sympathized with its deep religious influence. He interpreted its solemn lessons, as a prophet would interpret the symbols of momentous truths. His preaching was never more impressive than on these occasions. The most powerful of his published sermons was delivered at the close of the year 1826. The memory of that discourse and that night will go with many of us to our graves. My own impressions of Mr. Ware, as a preacher, were stamped at that time—once for all, and for ever. The fame of his preaching, mingled, perhaps, with some chastened feelings, and some desires reaching after the Eternal, had drawn a little company of my classmates from Cambridge to this church. We stood in the crowded gallery. The preacher's subject was the "duty of improvement"—a theme most applicable to the characters and feelings of the young. Every word, and tone, and gesture were calculated powerfully to impress the youthful mind. But the closing sentences, especially, came home to the heart with a thrilling effect. Their sounds lingered on the ears of hundreds throughout that night. Their distant echoes come back to me now. No words from mortal lips ever affected me like those. I can see his very look—I can hear his very tone, as, with the unction of a Paul, he uttered the solemn charge, with which that discourse concludes. 'I charge you, as in the presence of God, who sees and will judge you—in the name of Jesus Christ, who beseeches you to come to him and live—by all your hopes of happiness and life—I charge you let not this year die, and leave you impenitent. Do not dare to utter defiance on its decaying hours. But, in the stillness of its awful midnight, prostrate yourselves penitently before your Maker; and let the morning sun rise upon you, thoughtful and serious men.'"—p. 22, 23.

The following passage brings a picture before us, to which we turn with sympathy and interest:—

"But the intercourse of the fireside, and the instructions of the Sabbath, were not the only instrumentality, by which Mr. Ware edified his flock. His affectionate and ever laborious zeal sought out still other channels of religious influence. Of these, none was more valued by himself, or by his people, and none more efficacious, than a meeting

for Christian improvement and exposition of the Scriptures, which was held in the evening, in the old vestry in the tower of this church. That 'upper room,' which is now cheerless and deserted, was in former days 'furnished and prepared,' and regarded in the associations of many, as a very 'guest chamber,' for the entertainment of the Saviour and his disciples. The little company collected there, after the toils of the day were over, above the noises of earth, and still further above its vanities, sitting at the feet of their teacher, who was meek and lowly like his Master, realized, if two or three met in his name *ever* realized, the fulfilment of the Saviour's promise; felt that he was in the midst of them, and received into their spirits the benediction of his peace. Many precious seeds were sown in that narrow field; some of which have since ripened into virtuous characters on the earth, and not a few are bearing the fruits of immortality in some brighter world."—p. 21.

No ordinary man would quote for the happiest evenings of his life two such as Dr. Ware communicated as *his* happiest, to Mr. Robbins. But it speaks the devoted absorption of his whole being in his office; and, as we read the statement without a doubt of its perfect sincerity, we feel, in reading it, as if we were placed by the fountain-springs of his soul, and counting, through their stainless depths, the gem-sands over which they strayed:—

"In one of the last conversations, which I held with Mr. Ware, his thoughts, as was always the case when we were together, reverted to his old parish; but on that occasion with more than usual interest. I had never heard him express his affection for it so warmly. There was an unwonted tenderness in his tones. The pent up feelings of years seemed to pour forth in a few glowing words. The habitual reserve, which covered the strong emotions, whose existence in his bosom no one could doubt, was for the time forgotten. The veil, that spread before the sacred treasures of his soul, was for a moment lifted up. He told me of those persons and scenes, whose images were nearest to his heart. He told me of those hours and occasions of his ministry, which were of dearest remembrance. And amongst them all, and, as he said, most beautiful and precious of all, were the friends who had stood near him in that humble room, and the evenings that were there spent in social devotion. I shall never forget the emphasis with which he said, 'The two happiest evenings of my life,' and repeated, 'yes, the two happiest of my life, were one of them, when we had met to converse upon the Lord's Supper, and the vestry was so full, that we were obliged to adjourn to the church; and the other, when, after an interesting discussion, we sang together at parting, as if every soul present felt the grandeur and joyousness of the sentiment, the hymn which concludes with this glorious verse,' which he then repeated:—

> ' Then let our songs abound,
> And every tear be dry,
> We 're marching through Immanuel's ground,
> To fairer worlds on high.' "—p. 21, 22.

Mr. Robbins takes a brief notice of the visit of Dr. Ware to Europe. He might justly calculate upon the feelings with which the tidings of his death would be received among his known and unknown friends in this country. We have heard but one voice in relation to this event; and we are confident that the impression of it will not quickly be effaced:—

"From the spring of 1829 to the summer of 1830, Mr. Ware was travelling in Europe. It was a tour, not of relaxation only, but of rich improvement to his mind and heart. Nearly his whole pathway through foreign lands was smoothed by kindness, and enlivened by hospitality. The homes of strangers were opened to him, in his absence from his own. New friendships were established in almost every city and town in which he tarried,—friendships, some of which were afterwards continued across the ocean, and will be renewed beyond the grave. Important information was collected in regard to the state and prospects of Liberal Christianity, and new ties of sympathy and respect were woven between our toiling fellow Christians in Great Britain, and their less molested brethren here. Henceforth, the person and the name of Henry Ware will be as dear in the mother country as in this, and the intelligence of his death will be received with as unfeigned demonstrations of respect. With the single exception of Dr. Channing, there is no preacher of our denomination, whose works have been so extensively circulated beyond the Atlantic, or whose influence is so valuable and so deep."—p. 32.

The following is the paragraph in which the last moments of this amiable and exemplary man are referred to. The subject required a fine touch, and has obtained it.

"He was now constantly anticipating a sudden call to depart, for which nothing remained to be put in readiness; and there is no doubt, that he was aware of the time when the mandate came, and yielded himself up with a quiet and childlike submission. As Death came upon him, he threw gently over him the veil of deepest sleep, under which he lay for a few hours, still breathing composed and tranquil, *whilst his spirit was loosing itself from its worn-out members, and sighing itself back to God.*"—p. 41.

In justice to Mr. Robbins, we give his estimate of Dr. Ware's character. If there are parts of it which we could wish

altered in mere form, the *substance* of the passage does credit to the writer, and no more than just honour to the pure and pious dead:—

"And now, my friends, that I have traced my beloved predecessor, through the paths of his mortal pilgrimage, so far as they have been known to me, and as truthfully as I have been able,—what remains, but that I should endeavour, in a few words, to draw, from the scenes and actions through which we have followed him, a connected portrait of his character.

"I approach this duty with a trembling hand, I never came near Mr. Ware whilst he lived, without a feeling of mingled reverence and love; and now that he is no more, I call up his moral image, I bring before me the likeness of his soul, with a still deeper emotion of sacredness and affection. If, whilst his spirit dwelt in the body; if, whilst its light beamed upon us through that benignant and earnest eye; if, whilst it meditated beneath that tranquil and capacious brow; if, when it spoke through those persuasive and serious lips; if, when it drew near to us in the intercourse of friendship, with that unequalled plainness and gentle dignity of manner, which so well became the guilelessness of its feeling, and the elevation of its intent; if, when it occupied the pulpit, with that look and air of apostolic gravity and tenderness, which made his appearance there so impressive and so welcome; if, when it went about amongst us, doing good in that humble garb, and with that quiet alacrity of mien, befitting a messenger of the cross; if, in each of these bodily conditions, his spirit sometimes impressed us with a hallowing sensation, how much is this influence deepened, as we contemplate it abstracted from its mortal habiliments.

"As it floats before my inner vision, I see the clear radiance of heaven-born Purity; I see the placid smile of Peace; I see the most rare expression of Humility mingled with Self-respect; I see the serious look of Godly fear; I see the august figure of Truth; I see the likeness of angelic Love—I see all these moral features blended gracefully together, and all quickened and glowing with intense yet chastened Activity—yes, life; spiritual life; earnest, unfaltering, God-serving life; dutiful, beneficent activity,—this is the quality that pervades and animates and distinguishes the whole.

"Such are the most striking spiritual lineaments, which, shining before the soul's eye, as in the mild light of heaven, are grouped together into the sainted likeness of him whose mortal countenance we shall see no more. No more, did I say? No more with the bodily vision. But the mind looks upon it now. Its portrait hangs in the heart. Every feature is true to the life. Every line and expression is perfect. We love to gaze upon it to-day; and we shall not lose it to-morrow. It will fade, only to be revived again. It will meet us in our walks. It will smile upon us at our firesides. It will brighten before us in our closets. It will appear to us in our dreams. It will not be veiled from us in our sorrows, nor be hidden from our joys. In the toils of duty, in the repose of meditation, in the days of our moral triumph,

in the nights of our remorse, through all life's vicissitudes, and amidst its last solemn scenes, to many of us, who have known, and studied and loved it, it will again and again re-appear, and never, but, as when it looked upon us in the years that are gone, to make us purer, and calmer, and happier for the sight.

"It is not consistent with the purpose which I have proposed to myself in this discourse, for me to offer you, as might otherwise be appropriate in this stage of my remarks, a minute and elaborate analysis of Mr. Ware's character. It has seemed to me far better to represent it to you through the drapery of his works. My duty has been performed, if I have succeeded in exhibiting his leading aim, his principles, his capabilities, and his influence, by tracing the course of his life, describing his plans and modes of action, and exhibiting the impression he has produced, with the results he has accomplished. Besides, Mr. Ware's character was not a difficult one to understand. It had some shades, indeed, that all did not see,—shades of rare and delicate beauty, which were clearly perceived only by his most intimate friends. It had variety, too, and richness, reserved stores of genius, and strength, and love, and mirth, which kept alive the interest and curiosity of those who were most often in his society. But notwithstanding all this, so great was its simplicity, that any who knew him at all knew his principal characteristics. In his own family, he was in all important particulars what he was to the world. He was not one thing in one place, and another in another, but always the same. Though sometimes reserved, he never dissimulated. If he ever wore a veil, it was of nature, and not of guile. No man living was more truthful, or more in earnest in all that he said and did. His heart was too sound in virtue, to desire any false colouring on the surface; his soul was too ingenuous and noble to endure it, even if it had been needed. His conversation, his preaching, and his writings were, to a remarkable degree, the transcript of his own mind and heart, and because that mind was sound, and wise, and pure, and that heart warm, devout, and true, therefore it came to pass, that in all these modes of influence, he exerted an unusual and uniform power upon the opinions, sentiments, and principles of men. He was not a great logician, nor pretended to be; but when he reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and a judgment to come, with the earnestness of deep conviction, with the logic of common sense, with the authoritative arguments of truth and love, the reason assented, the conscience trembled, the heart submitted. He was not a profound theologian, nor pretended to be; but his mind was well furnished with the most valuable treasures of sacred lore, and held at its command a magazine of illustrations, expositions, and proofs of all the great doctrines which he had examined, and believed, and therefore preached. He was not a graceful rhetorician, if judged by artificial rules, nor pretended to be; but in that plain, serious, earnest eloquence, which is most appropriate to the pulpit, whether we estimate him by the interest his preaching always attracted, or by the effects it often produced, he has left behind him no superior, and not many equals. He was not a scholar, in the ordinary acceptation of that word; nor a man of brilliant talents,

nor pretended to be; but in amount and variety of general and useful knowledge, in quickness of intellectual perception, in correctness of taste, in the finer qualities of a poetic imagination, and in fervour and fertility of genius, he has given abundant evidences of high natural endowments and excellent culture. But better than all, he was a good, a sound, a faithful man. His superiority is not seen in any conspicuous feature of greatness, but in the fulness and proportion and solidity of his moral manliness. He was a hero of the Christian stamp; brave in the cause of virtue, without the flourish of arms; invincible in integrity, without boasting or arrogance; prompt in enterprises of benevolence, without impetuosity; patient in hardships, without the thirst of glory; overcoming evil with good, and achieving the victory over the world, with the sword of the Spirit, under the breast-plate of faith and love. 'The same shall be called *great* in the kingdom of Heaven.'"—p. 41-45.

J. J.

Art. VIII.—OUR REVIEWERS REVIEWED.

1. *The Book Department of the Unitarian Association.*
2. *Holy Songs and Musical Prayers.*

I. Our observations on the very defective Catalogue of the Unitarian Association have elicited a reply of some length from its Committee. We shall first give the letter of its Secretary, and then respectfully show it were better it had not been written.

To the Editor of the Christian Teacher.

Sir,

The passage in your last number relating to the Book Department of the Unitarian Association was brought under the notice of the Committee at their last meeting, and I was instructed to offer some remarks in reply. Your observations on the poverty of the Catalogue seem to be founded on a misapprehension of the object with which that department is maintained, and the plan on which it has hitherto been conducted. The reason why the Catalogue does not contain the books which you mention is the very obvious one that the Association does not profess to supply the Unitarian public with works which can be equally well purchased of the Booksellers, and which could not be supplied by the Association to any advantage. The Association neither could perform, nor ever attempted to perform, the part of a general Bookseller. Its object is, as I have been accustomed to understand it, to cherish and keep before the public useful works which need its encouragement, and without its aid would sink into oblivion or not exist at all. Hence it possesses, with few exceptions, the entire stock of books upon its Catalogue, or has purchased at an advantageous price large portions of the stock. The catalogue must needs therefore be much the same from year to year until the said stock is disposed of. Some of their works may appear obsolete or even valueless. In point of importance and value for general circulation, they may bear no comparison with the excellent works which you mention; but you would not have them destroyed or considered as waste paper, especially as they come in well for gratuitous distribution, when the subscribers seem to be fully supplied. Hence the list, as you call it, "of stale goods;" but let not the works which have some merit, and which have proved of some service in their time, be altogether spurned, although in a great measure superseded by superior publications on the same topics.

A few new additions are made to the Catalogue every year with such judgment as it is in the power of the Committee to exercise. The excellent works of the Rev. Newcome Cappe and Mrs. Cappe have this year been added, because the Committee were offered the remaining stock of these books at a very cheap rate; and it was thought that the

Subscribers and friends would be very glad to have them in the condition and at the price at which they would be offered. Surely these books are well worth rescuing from the cellars of a bookseller at York and placing before the public on highly advantageous terms. This seems to be an obvious instance of the advantage connected with the Book Department of the Association, that, as a Society, it can do for works that do not deserve to be entirely forgotten, what no individual would do.

In looking over the works which you have enumerated as fit for the Catalogue, some were published with a handsome list of subscribers, who thus rendered unnecessary any agency of the Association to call them into being, or give them circulation; others have been popular and profitable to their authors, and needed no support; others, such as Norton on the Genuineness of the Gospel, are much too expensive for the Association to deal with—books for the library, which no person would think of coming to the Association for. I apprehend that the subscribers to the Book Department, unfortunately not very numerous, do not generally expect a '*quid pro quo*.' Their complaint, if they do complain, 'that the subscription is a dead loss to them,' is founded on a misapprehension of the object of the Society at its foundation. They must not come to the office of the Association, as they would go to a bookseller's or other shop, to get a full equivalent for their money or to get gain to themselves. When the Book Society was established many years ago, I apprehend it was not their own advantage merely which the founders had in view; but rather the circulation, the charitable and gratuitous distribution, of works on religion, which needed their aid either to be supplied cheap or to be widely dispersed. Whether the department is wisely conducted or not, whether it may be made more useful than it is, and in what way, are questions worthy of consideration; but its true end should at least be regarded, and its plan and system judged of, with some reference to the views of the original founders and its principal supporters. The plan has for some time been this—to put no work on the Catalogue which has not been read and approved by three members of the Committee; and if approved, to obtain it upon such terms as would permit of its being supplied advantageously. With regard to some of the works which you mention as fit to be dispensed with altogether, as Gabriel Watts' Words of Wisdom, Townsend's Catechism, Two Tracts by a Lady, it happened that either the MS. or the entire copies were given to the Association, and the Committee thought them worth having, and put them on the Catalogue at the price that appeared suitable.

You will be glad to hear that a reprint of Mr. Yates's 'Vindication of Unitarianism' and 'Sequel' has been under the consideration of the Committee for months past. The learned author himself has given some encouragement towards the undertaking. But a large outlay having been made in the publication of the Greek Testament and Turner's Lives, and the returns being slow, the sales perhaps not altogether equalling expectation or the merit of the works, it is necessary to be cautious and discreet in the investment of large sums in this way, and

we must proceed in some degree in the road in which we find the approbation of our Subscribers and the public direct us. Besides the Greek Testament and Turner's Lives, among the valuable works which we have been instrumental in calling into being or rescuing from oblivion, I would beg to call your attention particularly to Wilson's Concessions of Trinitarians, in the publication of which the Author was much aided by the guarantee of the Association to purchase a large number of copies; to the very remarkable Sermon of Dr. Cudworth before the House of Commons in 1647, well worthy of your notice; to the late new edition of Sir Isaac Newton's Historical Account of Two Notable Corruptions of Scripture; and the valuable Sermons preached at the Annual Meetings of the Association, which are an honour to their Authors and the Society. Permit me also to add, that the mode in which you have contrasted the large amount expended upon books with the small amount of the proceeds, might lead a person but little acquainted with the operations of the Society to suppose that the sum of £23. 16*s.* 10*d.* represented the value of all the books issued during the year; whereas, in addition to this, books to the value of £66. 9*s.* 5*d.* were issued to the Subscribers, and books and tracts to the value of £65. 13*s.* 8*d.* were distributed gratuitously to various congregations and individuals. The sale of publications which are not of an ephemeral character cannot be expected to be very rapid, and the effect of the large outlay must therefore be looked for in subsequent years.

I might enter upon many other considerations which influence the Committee in their proceedings. They are at all times glad to receive hints and suggestions from friends and supporters, who have but the good of our common cause in view. They feel obliged for your review of the last report in general. It is doubtless the want of more frequent communication that occasions misapprehensions which a little explanation would easily remove; and you, Sir, as the Editor of the Christian Teacher, are well aware how important it is that we as Unitarians should strengthen each other's hands where we can do so conscientiously and effectively, causing the good work thereof to prosper, instead of overthrowing the temple we are employed in building, by being divided against ourselves.

I remain, Sir,
On behalf of the Association,
Yours, very respectfully,
(Signed) Edward Tagart,
Hon. Sec.

On the receipt of this communication, we signified to the Secretary that there was a discrepancy between his defence of the Catalogue, and the disclosures of the Catalogue itself,—but as the Letter was not withdrawn, nothing remains for us but to justify ourselves.

1. The Committee, through its Secretary, states that the

poverty of its Catalogue is owing to the very nature and design of the Book Department of the Association, the object of which is, "*to cherish and keep before the Public useful works which need its encouragement, and without its aid would sink into oblivion or not exist at all.*"

Now we turn to the Catalogue, and we find it contains works of Channing, Mrs. Barbauld, Joanna Baillie, Bowring, Dewey, Ware, Acton, Lardner, Locke, Milton and Newton. Does the Secretary wish us to believe that Channing's writings, every one of which are now upon the Catalogue, that Mrs. Barbauld's Hymns, that Locke's Reasonableness of Christianity, that Bowring's Matins and Vespers, that Henry Ware's Offices, and Life, of the Saviour, would "sink into oblivion or not exist at all," but for the fostering care of the Book Department of the Association? There are, then, upon its Catalogue books that do not *require* its patronage, and the question we asked, and now ask again, is, why, on the principle which admitted them, is not the number extended so as to present in the Catalogue of the Unitarian Association, a full list of the best publications on Unitarianism, both ancient and modern.

Many Authors whose names are in this Catalogue will, we fancy, hear with some surprise that their works, by that circumstance alone, are saved from sinking into oblivion, or non-existence: and all those whose names are not in the Catalogue may comfort themselves with the reflection that, *according to its Secretary*, the Association admits no books which can live by their own merit.

2. The Committee, through its Secretary, states that the Association "possesses with few exceptions the entire stock of books upon its Catalogue, or has purchased at an advantageous price large portions of the stock."

We are certain that the Association *could* "purchase at an advantageous price large portions of the stock" of *any* work which it chose to place upon its Catalogue. The proper object for the Association is not to purchase profitably, but to *distribute* advantageously for the interests of religious Truth. It should place on its Catalogue not the books which it can buy most cheaply, but those which it is of most importance to sell. We made no complaint, however, of what it has done, but of what it has *not* done. We never objected to the excellent works of Mr. and Mrs. Cappe being on the Catalogue of the Association, nor to their being "rescued from the cellars of a bookseller at York." But is it the policy of the Association to wait until books b come unsaleable, and have to be excavated out of cellars? If deserving of being on the Catalogue at all, they

ought to have been there long since. Why does the Association select the year 1843 for announcing the Works of Cappe amongst its novelties?

3. The Committee of the Association states that "some of their works may appear obsolete or even valueless. In point of importance and value for general circulation they may bear no comparison with the excellent works which you (the Christian Teacher) mention; but you would not have them destroyed or considered as waste paper, *especially as they come in well for gratuitous distribution, when the Subscribers seem to be fully supplied.*"

We exceedingly regret that any point of difference should have arisen between us and the Unitarian Association, and we would wish our defence of ourselves to consist with our high respect for the objects and purposes of the Association, but here we have its Secretary's word, (yet strange to say in answer to our charge,) that a portion of its stock of books is obsolete and valueless, though not to be destroyed as waste paper, because when the *Subscribers* will have nothing more to do with them, they come in well for *gratuitous* distribution. If this is the state of the case we can only hope that the distribution will be very rapid. The Secretary admonishes us that we should not spurn works which had "some merit" and did "some service in their time," because they are "superseded by superior publications on the same topics." We did nothing of the kind; we only lamented that these "superior publications" should themselves be excluded by the inferior.

4. The Committee states that "the Association does not profess to supply the Unitarian Public with works which can be equally well purchased of the Booksellers, and which could not be supplied by the Association to any advantage."

But the Association *does* offer to the public, through its Catalogue, works which can be equally well purchased of the Booksellers, and which the Association does not supply to any advantage. And not only so, for, in addition, the Association in advertising its Catalogue, in the public papers, informs the public, that the works advertised can be obtained equally well at a Bookseller's, and gives the Bookseller's name. To give one example, out of a large number, of the discrepancy of the Secretary's statement with fact. In the Association's Catalogue of 1843 we find Acton's Lectures on the offices of Christ entered at 2*s.* 6*d.*; we give an order to a Bookseller and purchase a single copy of the work for two shillings. This is supplying, but not to any advantage *to the purchaser*, the part of a general Bookseller by the Association.

5. The Secretary states that "some of the Works enumerated by us as fit for the Catalogue were published with a handsome list of subscribers, who thus rendered unnecessary any agency of the Association to call them into being, or give them circulation."

Again we answer that this is putting forward, in defence of the Catalogue, a principle which the Catalogue itself shows not to have been regarded in its construction. There is, besides, in the Catalogue one work at least, *Wilson's Scriptural Illustrations of Unitarianism*, published by subscription, and which appeared for the first time in the Catalogue of the Association on reaching its *Second* Edition. That work well deserves its place there, but why does the Secretary rest his defence of the Catalogue on a principle which would exclude that work? Of all the works, moreover, which were mentioned as proper for the Catalogue of the Unitarian Association, only those of Dr. Carpenter were published by subscription. But again we affirm that not the *needs* of a book or an Author, but the *benefit* of Truth and the public should direct the selections of the Association. Nor need this lead to any heavy expenditure, for though the Association should *offer* through its Catalogue all really good books, there is no necessity upon it to purchase to a greater extent than they are actually wanted.

6. Among other things "rich and rare" to which the Secretary calls our especial attention, in the last Catalogue of the Association, is a Sermon by Cudworth, preached before the House of Commons in 1647. We beg to inform him that it has already been before us so long, that we cannot remember how long, in a Liverpool edition.

7. The Secretary complains that our mention of the amount received for books *sold*, might be mistaken for the whole value of books *issued*, during the year.

This is a kind of criticism which we do not comprehend, and must plainly so. Our review distinctly stated that £23. 16*s.* 10*d.* was the whole amount received for Books *sold*; and it also stated the amounts of Books *distributed*, namely, "tracts to the value of £15 to Montreal;" Books and Tracts to various Congregations in England and Ireland to the amount of £31. 19*s.* 2*d.*, and a "number of books and tracts" (value not given in the Association's report) "for distribution at the Mauritius and the Cape of Good Hope."

8. The Secretary finishes with a paragraph which we have doubted whether we ought to meet with remonstrance and grave rebuke, or merely put aside with a little gentle ridicule. We think it best to leave it to *him* to determine whether we are 'grave or

gay,' when we assure him that nothing was farther from our thoughts than the "overthrowing of temples", when we ventured a remark upon the Catalogue of the Unitarian Association.

For the Unitarian Association it cannot be necessary for us to express our sentiments of respect, or to avow our sympathy with its objects; and much do we mistake the spirit that rules it, and the characters of the men who compose it, if it has any wish to lead a comfortable life of self-flattery, and would not rather court than discourage a candid and honest criticism, however searching, in all its operations.

Finally, we are satisfied that but one principle should regulate the Book Department of the Unitarian Association, a desire to present the public with a complete list of the best works on all the subjects in controversy between Trinitarians and Unitarians.

We might easily offer an amended and larger list of *desiderata*, but we think it more respectful to leave the matter now in the hands of the Association. Before closing we beg leave to add that we meant no disrespect to "Gabriel Watts' Words of Wisdom," or "Townsend's Catechism," or "Two Tracts on the study of the Scriptures, by a Lady,"—of all of which, possibly very much to our loss, we confessed our ignorance.

II. The Notice in our last number of Mr. Ogden's "Holy Songs and Musical Prayers," has called forth the following Letter from the Editor. We print it, premising that such parts of it as relate to *musical* points will receive a reply from one of the Reviewers, Mr. Gardiner of Leicester, the well-known Author of "the Music of Nature." On other parts of it the Reviewers request us to make some remarks on the present occasion.

Liverpool, Nov. 23, 1843.

My Dear Friend,

In the Christian Teacher for October, you have favoured with a notice more full than I could expect from a Theological Journal, a musical publication in which I have some small share of responsibility,—Mr. Ogden's 'Holy Songs and Musical Prayers.' With the *judgments* expressed in that notice I have not the least title or inclination to interfere. Holding as I do the highest doctrine respecting the 'rights divine,' and corresponding responsibilities of editors and critics, I should deserve only a short repulse, if I expected to be heard in appeal against any estimates or opinions by which my friend or myself might happen to suffer. But an Author may reasonably complain of a review in which false impressions are left of *matters of fact*, and both the nature of his design and the method of its execution are misrepresented. Had the review appeared in any other Periodical, I should have been indifferent to its character. But the almost unbounded confidence with which everything endorsed by your reception is deservedly regarded, makes it a matter of importance to correct misconceptions that may creep into your pages. That part of the review which refers to Mr. Ogden's wo k, occupies a

page and a half: in the course of which I notice the following mis-statements of fact.

1. The Preface is described as proposing a '*reformation in psalmody.*' It is said to be written 'with more zeal than acquaintance with the difficulties attending his' (the Editor's) 'proposed reformation in psalmody.' I am naturally anxious to be delivered from the charge of a foolish and self-ignorant ambition, which this passage would fasten upon me. Knowing scarcely anything of music, I should deserve only ridicule, did I entertain any design like that which is here ascribed to me. But the Preface puts forth no pretension of the kind. Its whole scope is a continued disclaimer of it: for, while it is an apology for the principles of taste which prevail in Mr. Ogden's compositions and adaptations, it expressly says that the defence goes no further than this particular class of melodies, and must not be extended into a general rule. For the simply defensive purpose of the preface, some familiarity with the general methods of criticism in matters of Art was alone necessary; for the design fancifully attributed to me by the reviewers, there is need of a scientific knowledge of music, which it is unjust to represent me as having ever pretended to possess.

2. Next comes a quotation from the Preface, ending with the following extraordinary sentence:

'Not content with *either dilemma*, I submitted my difficulty to a friend, *possessed in a high degree of knowledge, to find the music* that was wanted, if it already existed, *and the genius* to produce it, if it did not.'

I need not say that this is a sentence which no cultivated, or even simply grammatical man could write. Having quite offences enough against the Queen's English to answer for already, I felt, on reading it, unaffectedly ashamed of this new delinquency; but was a little relieved when, on turning to the original, I found the following to be the true text:

'Not content with either side of this dilemma, I submitted my difficulty to a friend, possessed, in a high degree, of the knowledge to find the music that was wanted, if it already existed, and the genius to produce it, if it did not.'

This may be treated, no doubt, as mere typographical blundering: but it is not pleasant to be even misprinted into unreadable composition. I am the less disposed however to refer the mis-statement of the passage to this cause, as you have shown your due appreciation of exactitude in this 'mechanical matter,' and have justly observed (in the Christian Teacher for April last, p. 236), that a 'careful correction of the press is indispensable; the absence of it stamps at once a slovenly and low character on any work.'

3. There are two other alleged quotations from the Preface in the course of the review: one, at the bottom of p. 420; the other, at the bottom of the next page. In reading them, I could not but remark the awkwardness of their verbal structure, and, in the second instance, the strange juxta-position of unrelated ideas: but as they were between inverted commas, which all veracious persons understand as an acknowledgment of citation, and were further introduced by the phrases, 'For it appears' "..." and, 'As we learn from the Preface,' "...," I entertained at first no doubt that I had written these sentences. On subsequently referring to the Preface, however, I found that *no such passages occur at all.* With respect to the first of them, the place in the Preface which it misrepresents *is* discoverable; with respect to the second, it is *not*: there is nowhere any sentence to which you can point as the one intended by the writers. To your upright and simple mind I need not indicate the essential character of this styte of quotation, so foreign to the whole spirit and conduct of the Christian Teacher. It was not to be expected that you should think it necessary, with such correspondents as yours, to keep watch against a proceeding of this nature.

4. The first of these alleged quotations is made, by the manner of its introduction, the instrument of another misrepresentation. 'The Editor is not aware of the difficulties which he has imposed upon his friend, in calling him to append notes to many of the hymns in this collection, *for* it appears they were "chosen out of the general mass, avowedly for the peculiarity they possess, in differing so much from the metres in common use." Had the Editor been a composer, he would have known that all music which is gratifying to the ear, is governed by certain laws in its movement, to which musical poetry must conform, not only in rythm (rhythm), but in the very formation of the words.' Now what '*peculiarity*,' does the reader infer from this, attached to the metres submitted to Mr. Ogden's skill? Wherein, is he led to believe, consists their difference from the metres in common use? Undoubtedly, he will suppose that they are *not* 'governed by certain laws in' their 'movement,' but are faulty in 'rhythm' and the 'formation of the words.' He will necessarily conceive that they offend in *all* these particulars (else why are they all mentioned?), and will expect to encounter in the volume only such verses as are *lawless*, because *unrhythmical* and *composed of ill-formed words*. As to this last item of offence, the phrase by which it is described ('formation of the words') is so vague, that it is only by inference that any precise meaning can be attached to it. There is only one property of a word, by which it can either suit or spoil a *metre*, viz., its accentuation: take care that your accents fall right and your metre cannot be wrong: and since the reviewers are describing the characteristics attaching to the *metre* of the hymns ('the peculiarity they possess in differing so much from the metres in common use'), I conclude that this is the point to which they intend to refer. There is indeed another property in words, which may make them more or less agreeable to the singer, viz. the length or shortness of the vowel-sound in the accented syllable. It is always an advantage (to an English writer however an advantage frequently unattainable) to have a prolonged note attached to a full vowel, and to avoid sharp consonantal accents, on which the voice cannot dwell. But this has nothing to do with *the metre*; which is the thing called in question by the reviewers. The readers of the review are told then, that 'the peculiarity' of the hymns consists in their dispensing with the restraints of proper *rhythm* and *accentuation*; or,—to change the phrase,—that the metrical composition is *bad of its kind*, and was selected for the musician on this very account. The examples which follow all assume this interpretation of the passage, and bring charges against the hymns, as presenting an impracticable task to Mr. Ogden's art. Now the original passage simply intimates that the metres were not '*Long*,' '*Common*,' '*Short*,' or of the most current sort of '*Proper*' metre: but had a rhythmical movement of a different structure, and so required different tunes. A metre of *any* sort,—if it only *be* a metre,—true, that is, to its own system of proportional parts,—may be set to music: and there are no 'difficulties' 'imposed upon' a musical writer to whom they are submitted, from mere *rarity of kind*, so long as they are *good of their kind*. Little as I know of music, I am not so ignorant of the common principles of scanning and accentuation, as to commit the absurd blunder with which the reviewers charge me.

5. There are three examples adduced of faulty rhythm and accentuation; all of them, strangely enough, laid to the charge of the poetry, though two of them are exclusively affairs of musical pause and quantity. This, however, is of no consequence; for the reviewers have mis-stated the fact in every instance.

(a.) They say that the word '*apt*' ought to have a *short* note in the following line:—

O máke | us ápt | to séek | and quíck | to fínd |

The line consists of five Iambs: in the second of which the word '*apt*,' forms the *long* syllable. Can their meaning be, that the sharp vowel-sound in

this monosyllable is unsuitable to the prolonged musical note to which it is adapted? Then surely they should have expressed themselves differently. It is not, that *this word should not have a long note*, but, that *the long note should not have this word.* It is however manifestly impossible to secure a full vowel for every long note or accented position: and neither in this hymn, nor in the others belonging to the volume, do the sharp accents occur with any greater frequency than in the hymns expressly selected for musical adaptation by Webbe, Shore, Taylor, and other composers guided chiefly by the rules of their own art.

(b) They say that some of the hymns in this volume can no more be set to music than a catalogue of household furniture: and exemplify this remark by citing Bishop Heber's Evensong, which is as follows:—

Gód that | mádest | eárth and | heáven,
Darknéss | and líght!
Whó the | dáy for | toíl hast | gíven,
For rést | the níght!
Máy thine | ángel- | guárds de|fénd us,
Slúmber | swéet thy | mércy | sénd us!
Hóly | dréams and | hópes at|ténd us,
This líve | long níght.

Now it is not a matter of opinion, but a matter of undeniable fact, that this hymn is absolutely perfect in its metrical structure, with the single exception that the word 'Darkness' in the second line is a Trochee instead of an Iamb. Its faultlessness in all other metrical respects must be perceived at once by any one who can scan. The reviewers, I suppose, had tried their hand upon it in vain;—puzzled perhaps by that admixture of Iambic with Trochaic lines, which constitutes one of the greatest and most established beauties in the mere mechanism of verse.

(c.) It is asserted that the words '*Remit all our,*' in the following line,

'Remit all our offences, we entreat,'

are 'repeated three times before the important word "offences" is' allowed to follow. Now in *no* sense are these words repeated more than twice; by no singer are they repeated more than *once*; and in no *correct* sense are they repeated at all. They occur in a *fugue passage*, and are assumed successively by the different voices, beginning with the underparts, and terminating with the *first* voice, which gives them *only once*. I need not say that this is not what is meant by *repetition* in the standard language of musical criticism, and that a false impression is left by the employment of this phrase. Whether, when the fact is truly stated, the passage is still open to the reviewers' objection, is a matter of opinion to which I have no title to advert.

Naturally enough, the reviewers are as little fortunate in their distribution of praise, as in their award of censure. Of the *five* compositions which are mentioned with unqualified admiration, *three* are less perfect in the mechanism of the verse than any which have been selected for animadversion; and one poem (p. 40.) contains more metrical licenses than any hymn in the collection: so that nothing but its extreme beauty in other respects would have induced me to consign it without alteration to the skill of my musical friend. Nevertheless, when the utmost has been done which the rigour of mechanical criticism can effect, I venture to affirm that the forty-two hymns in this volume contain fewer false accents than would be found in the same number of hymns taken at random,—I do not say merely from Watts and Doddridge, but—from the productions of the most musical of our sacred poets, Milton, Luther, and

Charles Wesley; writers whose musical flow of natural thought, as well as acquired knowledge of the laws of melody, the most exacting critic will not deny.

Thus then I have laid at your feet the burthen of my complaint; with perfect confidence that your sense of justice will lead you to give insertion to this letter in the next number of the Christian Teacher. I have been anxious to protect you from all occasion of controversy on this matter, by strictly limiting myself to an exhibition of *facts*; about which there is no room for any kind of doubt. The statements which I have made can be verified at once, by merely opening Mr. Ogden's book, reading the Preface, and scanning the metres to which reference has been made. This is a mere mechanical business, within reach of any body that can spell and count his fingers. By what unnatural mishap,—of what strange spirit, so utterly alien to your own,—it can come, that correspondents of *yours*, in reviewing a publication of *mine*, (for, after all, the criticisms refer to the literary, not the musical, part of the work,) should mis-quote passages, fabricate sentences, commit errors in *every* remark on the details of accent and rhythm, and leave an incorrect impression of my whole design, I am altogether at a loss to conceive. The whole affair would be of little moment, were it not, that even in the most trivial tasks of criticism, accurate remark is the natural expression of a just and serene temper, and truth of statement is at least an approximate measure of veracity of spirit.

I remain, always, dear friend,
Affectionately yours,
JAMES MARTINEAU.

Now, we must, in the first place, clear the Review from the possible charge of giving judgment upon matters beyond its province.

The Christian Teacher does not profess to be a musical authority, but having a strong interest in the general design of Mr. Ogden's and Mr. Martineau's Work, heightened by a consideration of the quarter from which it proceeded, we deemed ourselves extremely fortunate in securing as its Reviewer so high an authority as the Author of 'the Music of Nature,' and in being able to associate with him one with whom he has always taken 'sweet counsel' on these subjects, a reverend gentleman, himself no mean proficient in the science of music, and one whose literary reputation was long ago cited by Dr. Parr as contributing to redeem the dissenting ministry from the reproach of 'unlearned.' In such Reviewers we could place nothing short of absolute confidence, and on all points connected with music we leave their vindication in their own hands. On matters not strictly musical they have requested us to make, in their names, the following replies, under the several heads of Mr. Martineau's complaint.

1. They think he has no reasonable ground of objection to the expression, 'proposed reformation in psalmody,' when applied to a work which proposes to find musical expression for a

large class of "*productions*" (we quote from Mr. Martineau's preface,) "*belonging to the highest order of sacred poetry, for which no suitable musical expression could be found throughout the usual range of psalmody*,"—in which, "*the more perfect the adaptation of the music to the theme prescribed, the more certain is it that the restraints of ordinary psalm tune writing cannot have been observed*,"—and which acknowledges "*the wide departure of many of the compositions from the rigour of the ecclesiastical style*,"—and that "*the* words *for which they have been written deviate considerably from the established character of Church poetry*." Surely this is the proposal of a reformation in psalmody, according to the common use of language, and, if the work has succeeded in its express aim, it is a reformation to have introduced into the service of the Church a large class of Hymns, of the highest order of poetry, hitherto excluded by the want of suitable music. Mr. Martineau says that he "defends the principles of taste which prevail in Mr. Ogden's compositions and adaptations," "no farther than this particular class of melodies:" but surely the attempt at reform is attributed to him "*no farther than the particular class of melodies*," which make the work under review. No designs of reform are attributed to him beyond what he has avowed and published.

2. In the passage quoted from Mr. Martineau, and complained of as misprinted, the definite article is dropped before the word 'knowledge,' the commas are not right, and 'either dilemma' is a blunder, of the pen or of the types, it is now impossible to say which, for "either side of this dilemma." We frankly confess that such blunders ought not to occur, but as no one could attribute such a blunder to Mr. Martineau, nor to any one else who ever ventured into print, the injury to him is not great, for the correction is obvious. We are sincerely sorry that the beauty of his writing should be marred by misprinting in our pages, but his argument that the error belongs to the Reviewers, (does he he mean intentionally?) because the Christian Teacher had expressed its sense of the importance of mechanical correctness, is not fair towards them. No Periodical, nor other printed work, can pretend to be quite free from typographical errors; not absolute faultlessness, but a *habit* of accuracy and care is the severest law it can be expected to observe. Besides it would really not improve the matter, if we had supposed our Reviewers correct in their citation, and, which we must have done in that case, deliberately referred the blunder, as a *literary* one, to Mr. Martineau. We cannot therefore accept Mr. Martineau's clearance of the Christian Teacher, at the expense of its Reviewers.

3. Mr. Martineau justly complains of two misquotations from his Preface. We do not agree with him that his meaning has been misrepresented; but certainly his writing has been disfigured, a great liberty has been taken with his words, and an appearance of quotation given to passages which only contain his supposed meaning, in a manner that we will not, in the slightest measure, defend. We are instructed to say, that the Reviewer had no thought of misrepresenting Mr. Martineau, and loosely marked what he understood to be Mr. Martineau's meaning, to distinguish it from his own observations. We shall make all the reparation that is now in our power by printing together the passages as given in the Review, and their foundations in Mr. Martineau's Preface:

(a) The Review, p. 420, vol. v.:—

"They were '*chosen out of the general mass, avowedly for the peculiarity they possess, in differing so much from the metres in common use.*'"

Mr. Martineau's Preface, p. i.:—

"*On account of this very deviation in sentiment as well as metre, they were selected from the general mass of hymns and submitted to the Author, in order to be treated as exceptions, not as specimens.*"

(b) The Review, p. 421:—

"The book is handsomely printed, and, as we learn from the preface, it '*has given great pleasure to the circle of the Author's friends, though its plan and performance have deviated so much in sentiment and metre, from the rigour of the Ecclesiastical style,*' we hope and believe that the religious public will receive the same pleasure, and form the same favourable opinion of it."

Mr. Martineau's Preface, pages iv. and i.:—

"Should these general principles of criticism on church music fail to obtain the concurrence I could desire, *I shall yet feel confident that the domestic use of the present volume will prove to many a family a source of sacred delight. Grateful for the peaceful hours it has already given*, I please myself with the thought of its Sunday evening history for years to come; a history which I would that the Author's modesty permitted him to read."—p. iv.

"From this account an explanation arises of *the wide departure of many of the following compositions from the rigour of the ecclesiastical style.* The *words* for which they have been written, deviate considerably from the established character of church poetry. On account of this very deviation in sentiment as well as metre they were selected," &c.—p. i.

4. Mr. Martineau mistakes the *obvious* meaning of the following passage in the Review:—"All music which is gratifying to the ear, is governed by certain laws in its movement, to which musical poetry must conform, not only in rhythm, but in the very formation of the words. For instance, the word 'apt' is placed under a long note when it requires a short one." No one could justly conclude from this passage that the poetry was represented as defective in rhythm, but merely that there was something in the formation of the individual words, which rendered it difficult to *sing* upon them the long or short notes allotted to them. Mr. Martineau should have observed the difference between *when* and *where*. It is not said that the word "apt" has a long note *where* it (the metre) requires a short one,—but that it has a long note *when* it (the word) should never be sung to any but a short one. Mr. Martineau has indeed twice fallen on the real meaning, and, we think, the obvious one, of these passages, but only to set it aside, and direct the force of his answer against a meaning which, as we understand, the Reviewers never intended to convey. Whether they can justify it or not, which we leave to them, *their meaning is*, that in the compositions specified there is something in the formation of the words which renders it difficult or impossible to sing upon them the notes *which the metres required*. We cannot think that this is a matter upon which "any body that can spell and count his fingers" is competent to give judgment. We resign it to the Author of "Music and Friends."

5. Mr. Martineau states that the Reviewers, as might be expected, are not more fortunate in their praise than in their censure, and alleges in proof that the hymns attached to the praised *airs* are imperfect in the mechanism of their verse. Now it so happens that *only* the airs are praised, and nothing is said of the *words* attached to them. It is most likely that the Reviewers formed their judgment of the airs from the inarticulate organ or piano, without any reference to the hymns appended to them, which indeed they do not mention in any way.

We close, for the present, with the expression, in the name of the Review, of our sincere regret that Mr. Martineau should have had so much cause of just complaint of the Reviewers' method of quotation,—and in behalf of the Reviewers, of our confidence in their intention to do substantial justice. Mr. Gardiner, being more of an original thinker than a quoter of other men's writings, had, we suppose, little experience of the established practice in these things, and thought it not

wrong to refer an Author's *meaning* to himself, by distinctive marks, though not literally in his words.

We confidently hope that Mr. Gardiner, in his announced reply, will do full justice, whether it be for or against himself, to the Work under review, and by leaving no room for further complaint or controversy, close the subject.

THE

CHRISTIAN TEACHER.

Art. I.—NEANDER, ON THE FREE TEACHING OF THEOLOGY.

(*Concluding Letter.*)

Though I had not intended to write further on the subject of the free teaching of Theology, I cannot well omit to notice several objections and misconceptions which have appeared respecting my former Observations. I am resolved, however, to abstain from particular charges, and to dwell entirely upon the subject itself, with a view to avoid every thing which might offend individuals who are particularly dear to my heart, and who shall continue so, in spite of our present difference of opinion.

In the first place; that which I said about the propriety of settling our highest mental duties according to the ideal point of view from which we see the subject, has been so misunderstood, as to suppose that I set that ideal point of view against the historical or experimental view, and establish certain notions formed *a priori* as the rule of that judgment. Now, I never did place that ideal conception in opposition with historical experience, as such; but only in opposition with the practical result of that experience, as it appears empirically, at any one point of time. The contemplation of the pure ideal notion, according to my view, does not oppose, in any way whatever, the contemplation of the history of the object which corresponds to the notional conception in question: on the contrary, I acknowledge that history, (in the course of events), brings forth the Idea embodied, and in progressive development. To follow up that development historically, and to perceive the power of the Idea, is one and the same problem. But it is otherwise, if we

speak of the phenomena which are empirically perceived at any one period: for since the pure ideal notion of which we speak, owing to the opposition which it raises between the godly and the ungodly principles in human nature, cannot develop itself in a straight line, we may happen to find it, at any particular period, following its course in some of the devious and circuitous directions into which it is forced, against its natural tendency. The empirical point of view may indeed arise from the interference of some heterogeneous influence which has diverted the notional conception from its intended course. The works of man cannot be supposed free from such influence at any one given period: this mortal life of ours can only be gradually delivered from these disturbing agencies, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

There can be no doubt that if we proceed from this empirical view, making what once has been regularly established the supreme Rule by which to decide spiritual relations that are higher than the letter of any law, there is no limitation ever so opposed to the essential notion and demands of God's kingdom, no spiritual Despotism whatever, which may not be justified. According to such a view we must, in pure consistency, condemn every advance of the spiritual development, every Reformation which leads to the final victory of what is truly Christian over what is Anti-Christian. It was this very same View, this principle, which originally condemned Christianity itself, as a defection from ancestral and legal religion: *Religio a majoribus tradita, et legibus sancita.*

I hope I may be allowed to dwell a moment upon the fact which I have just mentioned, as one which cannot fail to give clearness to the whole subject. According to the fundamental view taken by the ancients, no general right of mankind freely, and in common, to unfold its powers,—no universal rights of man, as such, were recognised. Whatever nature bestows on Man, was supposed to belong to the State in which every individual was born, and could not be used except under the limitations prescribed by law. Every means of forming the mind was made subordinate to what might be called *political education.* In conformity with this principle, one religion alone—that of the State—could exist, and conformity to it, in all its externals, was one of the duties of the citizen. The introduction of a new religion was a political offence, unless the new religion obtained the sanction of the law. This was the case especially among the Romans, to whom the State was all in all. But Christian Divines, Lawyers, and Statesmen should be on their guard not to confound the universal and spiritually theocratical

constitution of Christianity, with the principle of the heathenish State-religions: they should avoid whatever coincides with the views and language attributed by Dio Cassius to Mæcenas, who advised Augustus to support the old national religion, and oppose the diffusion of all others; since to allow this rivalry opened a door to dangerous intrigues, and was very unfavourable to the monarchical principle.

If this empirical principle of law be granted, it cannot be denied that the Roman authorities acted throughout with perfect consistency and justice, when they wished to compel the Christians to comply with the externals of the religion established by the Roman State, and punished them on their refusing to perform that public duty. The language of the younger Pliny to Trajan is a natural consequence of the empirical principle which Juridical Theologians and Theological Jurists employ, exactly alike, in support of limitations to the liberty of theological teaching. But a religion had appeared in the world, which was to expose the vanity and nothingness of the ancient politico-religious point of view. It was a religion which published and realized a Godly kingdom—a kingdom of God—which was to embrace the whole of mankind; a kingdom with one immortal king, before whom every one within it must bend the knee; where every one must look upon his fellow-subjects as brothers employed in the same service; a kingdom animated by a peculiar Spirit, and regulated by peculiar laws. It was the Idea, (the essential notion), of this kingdom, which by creating a direct opposition to the State-religions of antiquity, was to burst the fetters by which they restrained the moral and spiritual progress of mankind.

This is the Idea which, obtaining currency by means of Christianity, was to oppose the juridical empiricism of the politico-religious view. That view, however, continued, for some centuries, to struggle against the power of the Christian principle, but was at last forced to yield. Thus foiled, it cast off the heathen form in which it had opposed Christianity, and assuming the much more dangerous appearance of a Christian feeling, made its way into the very heart of the Church. From that position it exerted its influence in keeping up the dominion of every error which bore the stamp of tradition, and in preventing the process by which alone Christianity could purify itself from every thing adventitious and foreign to its spirit. Yet the juridical empiricism began again not to be able to resist the progressive advance of the kingdom of heaven, and was forced to give way, at one time, to one of the revivals of the Christian Spirit, such as that which was exhibited at the time of the

Reformation; at another, to the change which Christianity is constantly producing, both directly and indirectly, upon public opinion. The power of the collective Christian Mind, which at this moment is variously and, in various countries, so strongly manifesting its opposition to that most fatal obstacle to the free progress of the Church—the combination and confusion of the political and the religious point of view—is one of the signs of the times which is both pointing to an approaching period of glory for the kingdom of Christ, and also paving the way to it. Every one who knows the powers which Christ has communicated and is constantly imparting to his kingdom, must cherish an ardent wish, that these powers may have unlimited room for action, so that, free from every extraneous influence, they may shape out and animate every thing about them; he must wish to remove every impediment to the unfettered collision of minds with each other; and to abolish whatever threatens to weaken, in one way or other, that activity of the true Christian Spirit, with which none are acquainted but those who can partake of it. Unquestionably, whenever a fresh mental creation is in progress, there must be a reaction on the part of the previously established empirical point of view, which, it is intended, should give way. But this reaction will only promote the victory of the notional principle—the Idea—as it already begins to appear in the events which have called forth this Explanation. This reaction will, of course, be most violent in countries, on which, by their rejection of the Reformation, the pure light of the Gospel has not yet dawned.

By this separation between Politics and Religion, we must not be supposed to deny that Christianity—that power which is appointed to embrace and pervade every part of the true nature of man, purifying it and ennobling it—should not exert its beneficial power upon civil life. But since the governing power of the State can best be benefitted by a settled conviction and acknowledgment, that there is a divine law entirely out of the reach of, and above, all human jurisdiction, everything hitherto said, not only proves the natural influence of Christianity upon Governments, but shows that, in order to enjoy the benefit of Christianity as an influence, we should not mix it up with that which is to be influenced. The intended beneficial effect of Christianity upon Governments presupposes, in fact, not amalgamation, but perfect distinction. If Christianity is truly to pervade the political Government, that object cannot be promoted by the subordination of the Church to the State, or by that appearance of Christianity which Governments have so often assumed since the time of Constantine. History informs

us that, on the contrary, Christianity itself is desecrated and polluted by such means—that godliness is thus degraded into worldliness, and hypocrisy invited to spread. But when the Church, left to the power of the indwelling Spirit, shall freely and without disturbance proceed in its external development by its internal activity;* when, by this means, the principle of Christian life shall have diffused more and more, among all ranks of the State, that holiness of mind whose fruits embrace whatever is best for mankind, it cannot fail gradually to improve and perfect every part of the political body. Neither Laws nor State Regulations can produce that by compulsion, which is reserved to the free agency of a certain State of Mind.

After all the general remarks which precede, we must give a decided prominence to that particular point especially asserted by us, namely, the unlimited freedom of theological teaching. We maintain our main principle without wavering, in respect to that freedom in its most comprehensive sense. The point is simple, and all fallacies, which attempt to obscure it, are vain. If Theology is a science, it must unfold itself according to the laws of all other sciences. Now, Science essentially rejects every limitation which does not proceed out of itself; everything which attempts to set it limits and rules from without. There can be no difference between Theology viewed as a Science and all other Sciences whatever. But, of course, I confine what I say to Theology *viewed as a Science.* For, I am perfectly convinced that the very essence of the theological Science demands the recognition of the Holy Scriptures as its rule, and fountain of knowledge, externally given and proceeding from Divine revelation and inspiration. But even in regard to this condition, (which according to our conviction we call essential), we must necessarily assert the same principle, which we established in common both for theology and the other sciences: the rule just mentioned, must not be forced upon it by the command of any external power. From such a source nothing but hypocrisy can come: and errors which are removed, not through the free progress of Truth, as the nature of Science and the laws of the human mind require, but as it were

* I cannot but remember the spirited words of a man, pious, indeed much misunderstood, but certainly not free from enthusiasm, who about the time of the Reformation preached many a truth worthy to be treasured in the heart—Gaspar Schwenkfeld: "We are not Jews (he said): the Jewish Hezekiah is dead; our Hezekiah lives still, and holds the Sceptre;—nay, 'whose fan is in his hand; who will thoroughly purge his floor and gather his wheat.' Under the new Covenant the Holy Spirit works from inwards to outwards, not from outwards to inwards, as under the Old. If Christianity is to proceed rightly, no internal work should be attempted in it from outwards to inwards, but, on the contrary, whatever is to be exterior must arise from what is interior."

by word of command, are sure to re-appear in a more formidable character. The only constraint which can make such errors surrender to the divine authority, lies totally within each mind, and proceeds from an internal power which forms itself internally by means of the very process of scientific development. No other constraint can be salutary to the Church. Provided Theology is not hampered and hemmed in, those very errors will bring her back to the acknowledgment of that Divine Authority, without which no truly Christian Theology can exist; without which Theology cannot assert its dignity and independence, as a Science, but must be plundered of all its subject matter by all other sciences. So it is that we do not demand any external assistance, any meddling from without, in the struggle which error and truth carry on in other sciences; but wait and look on quietly, in the full conviction, that error will fall by its own weight, and Truth rise triumphant through its indwelling power. With infinitely more confidence indeed may we leave to itself a Science which is so directly connected with God, a concern which so immediately depends on the power of his Spirit. The sacredness of the cause may well encourage our trust; but it can by no means alter that which essentially belongs to the notion of a Science as such. If we should be shocked at the idea of settling disputes by authority, in Sciences which concern the body, how can we recommend that method in matters relating to the happiness of our Souls? The notion of Science, and everything which is necessarily connected with that notion, must indeed be universally and invariably the same. Since God has ordained that Christianity should give origin to Theology, in the character of a Science which was to contribute to the progress of the Church, we are surely entitled to conclude that He intended to allow this Science its development according to those necessary laws which arise from the very essence of the human mind; and that it was his will that that science should advance, in this manner, towards the proposed end, which is the good of the Church.

From the very fact that a Faculty of Divinity exists in a University, it follows as a necessary consequence that Theology, as a Science, should be allowed the same freedom of development, as all other Sciences. It is, indeed, impossible so to set limits to the progress of Science, as to stop it in one direction, and give it free course in all others: for since all departments of knowledge must come into mutual contact, to set limits to one and leave all the others in perfect freedom, is to bring a number of conflicting views into the bosom of the Science thus limited, without giving it the power of softening or reconciling

them: a state of things most ruinous to the candour and honesty of its professors. Such a state of things must infallibly bring about the revival of the pretended opposition between Theological Truth and Philosophical Truth, which in the Middle Ages, and just before the Reformation, was the mask under which a creeping unbelief disguised itself:—The theory against which such powerful minds as that of Thomas Aquinas had to contend in the thirteenth century, and which, about the time of the Reformation, was finally overthrown by that simple faith which can subdue to itself and sanctify all the mental powers of man, would again spring up in the Christian world.

Nothing seems, therefore, to be left but that the Faculty of Theology cease to be a component part of the Universities; and that Clerical Seminaries be established, where Divinity be studied according to an invariable, external, fixed rule; taking care that whatever elements of other sciences are absolutely required for the study of Divinity, be so contrived, and dealt out, that they may not contain anything in opposition to the established theological system, nor lead to any view which might disturb it. But suppose all this possible. What would be the state of the Divines brought up in such Seminaries, when they came out? What an impression would the real state of the scientific world make upon them? Finding themselves unexpectedly engaged in a struggle so different from that for which they had been trained, would they not be in the most imminent danger of defeat? Or how could persons thus reared, out of the mental atmosphere of the age in which they are to live,—how could men, entirely wanting a personal experimental knowledge of that actual life, work upon it through the power of the Gospel?

We are, besides, firmly convinced that Theology has its principle of life only in that Christianity which animates and sanctifies the soul, which penetrates and enlightens the Spirit. As Theology, in the character of Science, sprung up originally from the Christian life, and acquired its development in accordance with an inward law which impelled it to describe what that life contained, so must all true Theology ever proceed from the same source. The divine things which Christ has revealed and imparted to mankind—which are indeed the very objects which Theology should teach us to unfold, defend, and apply, can only be lea nt and understood through the experience and life within us. In this sense we heartily subscribe to that sentence of Augustine, so frequently misunderstood, and, (because misunderstood), so frequently scouted: *fides præcedit intellectum*. We declare, with the Spenerian School, that the true Theology

is *Theologia Regenitorum,* the Theology of the regenerated. Theology is an empty name when it separates itself from Christianity; for no man can understand Christianity without living the life of a Christian; and this is clearly asserted by Paul, where he says that Spiritual things can be discerned and judged only by the Spiritual man. We also assert that as true Theology must proceed from life, so it is intended to re-act upon life. The duty of the Academical teachers of Theology is, in our opinion, not only scientific instruction, but pious edification; for since, as it has been proved, Theology essentially consists of both these things, the teacher should by no means separate them. We have nothing to do with those who, at all periods, are ready to repeat the opinion of Carpzowe, that pious instruction belongs not to the professorial chair, but to the pulpit.

Yet not even this principle of sound theological education—indispensable and essential as we acknowledge it to be—can be enforced by any external regulation, or reduced to the letter of a Statute: such an attempt can produce nothing but hypocrisy and a lifeless form of piety. If owing to certain errors which arise in the course of events, Theology has broken its due connection with the internal Christian life, nothing, except another course of events, another series of convictions, can bring it back to that intimate union. And this result cannot fail. The consciousness that Theology has become a mere nullity from the moment of that separation, must lead it back into the right path. Indeed, this retrograde motion has already begun, and increases every day. Force nothing; and the proper relation of Theology to the life of the Church will be restored. *May no pious Christian community, carried away by a zeal not according to knowledge, neglect that peculiar charge of a Church—the preservation of the pure Gospel in its proper activity—the employment of the talent committed by the Lord, (an occupation which allows not a divided energy),—and intrude upon a mental chain of phenomena which Providence directs by peculiar laws! May no Christian Church trespass upon that ground by means of external power!* External interference of this kind, be it ever so well meant, can only disturb and check the natural process. It is like the interference of an ignorant physician, who, instead of allowing free course to nature in her efforts to bring about a salutary crisis, applies, unseasonably, some powerful remedy, which gives a fatal turn to the struggle. No degree of sincerity, or piety, in the zeal which promotes such acts of interference, can prevent the great danger with which they are necessarily attended; for, the moment we overstep the limits of our ap-

pointed task, it is impossible to say where the progress of the intrusion will stop.

And here we find it necessary to touch upon the relation in which Theology stands to the Unity of the Church; for there are mistakes afloat on this subject which require to be removed. Unity is the essential point of distinction of the invisible Church,—that Church whose members exist scattered over the world under all the various forms which we see, bound together, in spite of intellectual differences, by Faith in Jesus, as their Lord and Saviour:—the rock on which the invisible Church is built. This invisible Church shows itself in a variety of ecclesiastical forms, under which there exists a variety of degrees of Faith and Christian knowledge. The perception of this variety ought not to lead us into a denial of the Unity of the invisible Church; for, among the various degrees of clearness and steadfastness of knowledge by Faith, we should distinguish the different relations in which "precious stones, gold, silver, wood, hay, and stubble," stand to the one ground. Catholics, and even Socinians, who walk faithfully, according to the measure of their Christian knowledge, we acknowledge as our brothers in the invisible Church.* The determination to make this acknowledgment only in accordance with the manner in which the main articles of Faith are expressed in the Augsburg Confession, would oblige us to exclude from that invisible Church, which embraces all ages since Christ, several of the most distinguished witnesses of the Christian faith—men who attested that Faith through their lives and sufferings—in the early centuries of Christianity: for it cannot be denied that, for instance, Justin, and John Chrysostom expressed themselves on dogmatic

* On this subject, and in connection with many of the views stated in the preceding pages, we cannot but quote the noble words of the enlightened Spener. "That may be true and saving Faith in one man, which, being attended with very essential errors, would be a cause of condemnation in others. Thus the apostles, in the days of Christ's mortal life, had true Faith, as Christ himself witnesses; and yet they did not hold the main articles of his Death and his Resurrection, nor, indeed, would they receive them. Nevertheless the Lord kept up in them that light of Faith which was enough to preserve them in a state of salvation, by enabling them to love their Master through that true, though scanty knowledge, of the Lord Jesus, as the Christ, which they possessed, and make them 'faithful in a very little.' It is, besides, dangerous to pass judgment about errors concerning the Faith, defining how great they are and how far they must exclude from Salvation; and, especially, when we speak of people who, from their youth, and, in a certain measure, without their fault, have been prepossessed by such notions. It must therefore be exceedingly difficult for such persons to cast off what they have imbibed in their youth, especially if they employ the small portion of truth they possess, faithfully and thankfully, in the service of God."—Vide *Spener's Lauterkeit des evangelischen Christenthums*, Part I. p. 717. It is true that this open declaration of Evangelical truth was charged to that pious man as a heresy of indifferentism, especially by one Löscher, in his *Timotheus Verinus.*

points in a manner which, according to the Confession of Augsburg, must be condemned as Arian, and Pelagian heresy. Perhaps, borrowing a principle from the Roman Catholics, it will be said, that as long as the Church had not developed its conviction upon certain points, a variety of opinion was allowable; but that as soon as the Church has come to a definite view, every member is bound sincerely and humbly to adopt it. To this we answer that the same advances of development, which we observe in successive ages, are repeated in every single period of time taken by itself. Mankind is as much under a process of development in its co-existing, as in its successive members.*

We are told that all error proceeds from sin. We do not deny a general connection of sin and error; but we beg to observe that the very circumstance of the universality of the fact renders it perfectly irrelevant in supporting a right in some to pass a damnatory sentence upon the opinions of others. For, since our nature is so universally under the disturbing influence of sin, where shall we find any one whose theological development is secure from error?

From the Unity which belongs to the invisible Church, and manifests itself in a multiplicity of external Church-forms, we must distinguish the peculiar Unity of each of these definite

* It is probable that this answer will appear both obscure and insufficient to many English readers. Germans, who having no religious party prejudices, are familiar with the philosophical phraseology of their country, will, on the contrary, be perfectly satisfied with the short reply of our learned author. It will not, therefore, be deemed presumptuous in the translator to attempt an explanation of the original, in this place. The evasion which Dr. Neander had to stop, implies that the Church (whoever and wherever that supposed visible ruling Church may be—which is the most difficult point of all) required time for the *development* of her belief. But if there was a time of development for the Church, on what ground can we assert that it ceased at any particular period? All that can be supposed is, that some part of the Church arrived at some Theological truths, in the course of the development which takes place successively from one age to another. But since all Christians had not come to the same result, at any one Chronological period which we may choose, it is clear that their course of development was still at a different stage. In other words, as portions of time, arbitrarily taken, when compared with each other present, in the prominent results, the process of development at different stages; so every one of those periods will be found to contain, in itself, individuals who, in point of development, may be said to belong respectively to every one of the preceding ages. To bring this nearer to the argument: if there was a time when Justin was not to blame for entertaining Arian notions, or Chrysostom for thinking as Pelagius did afterwards, because Theological development, measured by centuries, had not advanced the majority of Divines to a certain point; why should we blame those who, in any one period collectively taken, stand just at the point of development which is now made an excuse for the errors of Justin in the middle of the second century, and of Chrysostom at the close of the fourth and beginning of the fifth? It is not to be supposed that any intelligent reader will here say, that the difference is, that the *Church* has already decided. The question of an infallible church is not before us. The debate in which we are concerned, is entirely between Protestants.—TRANSLATOR.

bodies, as such. The principle of this Unity consists, historically, in the facts and principles from which each of these societies derives its existence. As long, therefore, as any such society continues to exist, its identity must be proved historically in reference to that principle of its origin. In regard to the Evangelical (Lutheran) Church, we must observe that the protest against the See and the Church of Rome, or even against all human authority, on points of Faith, is not a sufficient principle of identity; for this is a negative conclusion at which people may arrive from the most different views. Nor is it a sufficient mark of distinction, that the Evangelical Church acknowledges the Bible as the only source of her doctrines; for, besides that even the Socinians make the same acknowledgment, it should not be forgotten that all these declarations against Popery, against all external authority on matters of Faith, and in favour of the supremacy of Scripture, inseparable as they are from the Evangelical Church, were nevertheless not the cause, but the effect, of another principle which, having previously exerted its power on the minds and hearts of the leaders of the Reformation, was the real origin of that great event. We must look for the principle of the identity of the Evangelical Churches, in some one point, round which, as a centre, every thing which those churches conceive to be scriptural truth, arranges itself,—a point, in fact, which attracts and brings into unity all other individual doctrines. To find out this point, we must examine the process of development of the Christian life in Luther: for that must be considered as the original specimen whose characteristic marks must be repeated in the development of every one who is a living member of the Evangelical Church.

We shall find the central point we want in the fundamental truth to which the struggle of Luther's internal life finally led him: the truth out of which the whole Reformation grew up: the truth which, glowing as it came from the experience of his own heart, kindled the sympathy of every one who was capable of a like experience, into one holy flame: the truth which, still unconscious of its consequences, he promulgated in his Theses against Tetzel; and out of which a spontaneously growing Christian knowledge continued to develop itself in the form of consequences made clear by contrast with Popery, till, three hundred years ago, it grew into a connected doctrinal view, publicly professed as the distinguishing mark of the members of the Evangelical Church.

I speak of that collective fundamental principle which arises from the doctrine of Sin, Grace, and Justification, or to express it briefly, and as the fourth article of the Augsburg Confession

declares it, the conviction that we could not obtain from God remission of sins and justification through our own merits, our works, or any satisfaction; but that we obtain forgiveness of our sins, and become justified before God by Grace, for Christ's sake, through Faith. This is the fundamental truth which the apostle Paul opposes to the Jewish justification by works, and the all-sufficiency of the Law: this is the fundamental truth to which the Reformation gave currency against the Judaism which the Church of Rome had revived: this is the truth which the spirit of the Evangelical Church repeatedly and constantly opposes, not only to the justification by works of Popery but, to every kind of pretended moral sufficiency, in whatever shape it may appear: this is the unchangeable foundation of Christian Faith on which the Reformation arose, and through which it continues to work. A Church may continue to be Christian even when it has ceased to make that notion its peculiar leading principle; but its internal historical connection with the Church founded by the Reformation, cannot subsist after that link is broken. In a negative sense such a Church might certainly celebrate the Anniversary of the Reformation; but, a body of Christians who reject the main principle of the Confession of Augsburg, could not properly commemorate the solemn delivery of that document. If such be still the main principle of the spiritual life of our Church, her Theology, whose character depends on that life, cannot but be completely pervaded by it.

This principle cannot, however, be employed as an external rule, applicable to Theology as a Science; for no science (as was said before) can be subjected to rules which do not arise within it. As that principle passed over from the spiritual life of the Reformers to their Theology, so must it be communicated anew to our own, from the living source of our minds and hearts. No dead tradition will avail here: all must proceed again from the life of man. If we are convinced that the great truth just mentioned is necessarily connected with the whole notion of our Christianity, we should also trust that Theology, as it will develop itself anew out of the holy Scripture, in mutual action and re-action with the awakening life of our Church, will return gradually and scientifically to the acknowledgment of the main principle of the Reformation.

Gladly, indeed, upon the grounds herein laid down, shall we join in the commemoration of the Confession of Augsburg:*

* The famous Diet of Augsburg, for the settlement of the religious troubles in the empire, was opened by Charles Vth, on the 15th of June 1530. The protestant Confession of Faith was read on the 25th of the same month. It seems that a public commemoration of this great event was about to be made when Dr. Neander's pamphlet was published.—TRANSLATOR.

and ardently do we wish that the fundamental truth which (to use Luther's expressions) by its being publicly acknowledged, glorified Christ in the presence of the imperial Diet, may re-appear, by God's power, as the animating principle of the Church and its Theology. But strongly as we feel on these points, equally strong is our objection to the external limitation of Theology by the rule and measure of the Augsburg Confession.

To the reasons already given why that Confession should not be used for that object, we shall add, that, far superior as a Declaration of Faith, having its source in real spiritual life, and therefore full of practical tendency, as it must be acknowledged to be in comparison with all those œcumenical symbols of Faith, whose dialectic forms cannot come in contact with the immediate perception of Christian truth; still we must declare, that in several individual representations of doctrine, the Augsburg Confession does not come up to what we, in common with many other Divines, wish for, as an indispensable declaration of the Christian Truth. The letter of every declaration of this kind, like all human things, must be imperfect and changeable, although the Truth professed in them is perfect and for ever victorious. Confident of this, we feel assured that, provided the opposite and contending views which agitate our period are allowed free development and mutual comparison, a glorious period will arise from the present struggle, in which that Truth appearing in a nobler and purer form, and led by the hand of Him whose spirit guides the Church, will add a fresh triumph of divine Grace to those which, as epochs of a spiritual creative power, displayed themselves in the apostolic age, in the twelfth century, and at the time of the Reformation.

NEANDER.

Berlin, June 16*th* 1830.

ART. II.—CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE EDINBURGH REVIEW. By FRANCIS JEFFREY, now one of the Judges of the Court of Session in Scotland. 4 vols. London: 1844.

IT seems that the public is to be indulged, in due course of time, with republications of all the best articles in the Edinburgh Review. Sydney Smith's contributions led the way, and have already been followed by those of Lord Jeffrey and Mr. Macaulay; and others, we presume, are to come, in such doses as the public patience shall be found to bear without injury. If we may be allowed to judge from the prefaces to the two latter works, the authors have not been dragged without reluctance from their privacy, and the merit or demerit of the publication belongs, not to them, but to the proprietors of the Review itself.

Mr. Macaulay's reviewals will always find readers, as they do not refer to the topics of the day, but mostly to historical questions of permanent interest; and as they treat subjects with which every one is desirous of being acquainted, in an easy flow of language that is never wearisome. Sydney Smith's performances will perhaps be read for their wit. But those of Lord Jeffrey owe almost all their value to the writer's previously earned reputation. We should characterize him rather as a good reviewer, than a talented author: the merit of his writings is not intrinsic, but is bound up with that of the work which may be under his notice. He is remarkable for good taste, more than any other kind of talent, and consequently he pleases and instructs, not so much by his own reflections, as by judiciously pointing out the beauties and defects of another's composition, and selecting with art, such passages for quotation as are interesting to the general reader, and tell well in a reviewal. Hence his peculiar fitness for the task of Editorship, and the weight which his opinions carried with them: but hence, too, the comparative inutility of the republication after such a lapse of time. The works he reviewed have, long since, either been forgotten or become well known: in the one case no one cares to hear them criticised; in the other, their qualities are familiar to all.

Considered as a writer, his forte lies in a sort of ironical pleasantry, hardly to be called humour, though probably derived from the same sources—a quick sense of the ludicrous, joined with good-nature. The reviewals in which this faculty comes into play, are decidedly superior to those, where he exerts himself to be eloquent or profound. The notices of the memoirs of

the Princess de Bareith, of William Penn, of Curran, of Grimm's correspondence, and of Washington Irving's Bracebridge Hall, are far more calculated to be popular than the more lengthy and laboured disquisitions on political, historical, or philosophical subjects. It was therefore with some regret that we read the following passage in the preface: "What I now venture to reprint is but a small part, less, I believe, than a third, of what I actually contributed to the Review; and I have honestly endeavoured to select from that great mass, *not* those articles which I might think most likely still to attract notice by boldness of view, severity of remark or vivacity of expression, —but those, much rather, which by enforcing what appeared to me just principles and useful opinions, I really thought had a tendency to make men happier and better." We fear this laudable motive has led him to exclude much that would have been amusing, in order to make room for what he thinks instructive. No doubt the latter is the nobler aim, but the other was within his reach. Lord Jeffrey can be amusing enough—but it is no such easy matter to instruct the present learned generation. Men are seldom, we fear, made much "better or happier" by a repetition of hackneyed moralizing, in whatever elegancies of language it may be turned. An author must submit to entice his readers along—like children with pictorial alphabets—by amusing them while he teaches: otherwise his just principles and useful opinions will be wasted upon the upper shelf of the book case.

Lord Jeffrey however appears to have been unconscious of the true character and direction of his powers. Instead of cultivating his talent for lively satire, he strives to act the philosopher. He is seldom satisfied with simply passing judgment upon a work, without declaring pretty fully the abstracted, metaphysical doctrines upon which his verdict is founded. And in the present publication he puts in the van, as his masterpiece, a long and tedious tissue of metaphysics,—a disquisition on taste, and on the sources of our sensations of beauty. We do not rate the author very high as a metaphysician: there is a want of depth and originality in his thoughts; and the meaning is so buried in a cloud of words, that we are in danger of forgetting his premises before we arrive at his conclusions. He has not that precision in the use of terms, which is one of the most indispensable requisites of sound philosophy. The best parts of the article are the illustrations, descriptive of natural scenery and its effects upon the mind; some of which are admirably done. We extract the following passage, not as the best, but as being perhaps the most capable of standing apart from its context:—

"A thousand such analogies, indeed, are suggested to us by the most familiar aspects of nature. The morning and the evening present the same ready picture of youth and of closing life, as the various vicissitudes of the year. The withering of flowers images out to us the languor of beauty, or the sickness of childhood. The loud roar of troubled waters seems to bear some resemblance to the voice of lamentation or violence; and the softer murmur of brighter streams, to be expressive of cheerfulness and innocence. The purity and transparency of water or of air, indeed, is itself universally felt to be expressive of mental purity and gaiety: and their darkness or turbulence, of mental gloom and dejection. The genial warmth of autumn suggests to us the feeling of mild benevolence; the sunny gleams and fitful showers of early spring remind us of the waywardness of infancy; flowers waving on their tender stems, impress us with the notion of flexibility and lightness of temper. All fine and delicate forms are typical of delicacy and gentleness of character; and almost all forms, bounded by flowing or wavy lines, suggest ideas of easy movement, social pliability, and elegance. Rapid and impetuous motion seems to be emblematical of violence and passion; slow and steady motion, of deliberation, dignity and resolution; fluttering motion, of inconstancy or terror; and waving motion, according as it is slow or swift, of sadness or playfulness. A lofty tower, or a massive building, gives us at once an idea of firmness and elevation of character; a rock battered by the waves, of fortitude in adversity. Stillness and calmness, in the water or the air, seem to shadow out tenderness, indolence, and placidity; moonlight we call pensive and gentle, and the unclouded sun gives us an impression of exulting vigour, and domineering ambition and glory.

"It is not difficult, with the assistance which language afforded us, to trace the origin of all these, and a thousand other such associations. In many instances, the qualities which thus suggest mental emotions do actually resemble their constant concomitants in human nature, as is obviously the case with the forms and motions which are sublime and beautiful; and in some, their effects and relations bear so obvious an analogy to those of human conduct or feeling, as to force itself upon the notice of the most careless beholder. But whatever may have been their original, the very *structure of language* attests the vast extent to which they have been carried, and the nature of the suggestions to which they are indebted for their interest or beauty, Since we all speak familiarly of the sparkling of wit, and the darkness of melancholy, can it be any way difficult to conceive that bright light may be agreeable, because it reminds us of gaiety,—and darkness oppressive, because it is felt to be emblematical of sorrow? It is very remarkable, indeed, that while almost all the words by which the affections of the mind are expressed, seem to have been borrowed originally from the qualities of matter, the epithets by which we learn afterwards to distinguish such material objects as are felt to be sublime or beautiful, are all of them epithets that had been previously appropriated to express some quality or emotion of mind. Colours are thus familiarly said to be gay or grave—motions to be lively, or deliberate, or capricious—forms to be delicate or modest—

sounds to be animated or mournful—prospects to be cheerful or melancholy—rocks to be bold—waters to be tranquil—and a thousand other phrases of the same import; all indicating, most unequivocally, the sources from which our interest in matter is derived, and proving that it is necessary in all cases to confer mind and feeling upon it, before it can be conceived as either sublime or beautiful. The great charm, indeed, and the great secret of poetical diction, consists in thus lending life and emotion to all the objects it embraces."—Vol. i. pp. 50, 51.

The article which immediately follows, contains a long dissertation concerning the progressiveness of society. Lord Jeffrey is no believer in the doctrine of "perfectibility," and seems to have thought, indeed, that civilization had reached its zenith at the time he wrote. We have come, says he, to the rational age: our politics, and even our religion, are now matters of calculation, not of feeling or enthusiasm; we are too wise to be imposed upon by the delusions of poetry or art. The abstract sciences, which exercise the intellect only, are likely to flourish in times like ours, at the expense of all the arts which minister to the imagination. As science advances, a greater store of detailed knowledge is accumulated: the student has to spend a longer and a longer time in merely learning mechanically what has been already discovered; and hence cannot begin, till late in life, to occupy himself with original investigation. A man, who wishes to gain anything like eminence in science, will have to devote himself, more and more exclusively, to a single branch of it, and must exert one function of his mind, to the detriment of all the rest, which lie dormant. In short, he assumes that rationalism is the disposition appropriate to civilized times; and shows, with much ingenuity, that rationalism is opposed to improvement, and must tend to the deterioration of a people.

Concurring in his reasoning, we question the hypothesis on which it is founded. The exclusively "rational" temper to which he alludes, may be a mark of imperfect, not of perfect civilization. Probably it is only a stage through which society has to pass, not its final resting-place. "Les sciences," says Pascal, "ont deux extremités qui se touchent. La premiere est la pure ignorance naturelle, où se trouvent tous les hommes en naissant. L'autre extremité est celle où arrivent les grandes ames, qui ayant parcouru tout ce que les hommes peuvent savoir, trouvent qu'ils ne savent rien, et se rencontrent dans cette même ignorance d'où ils etaient partis. Mais c'est une ignorance savante qui se connâit. Ceux d'entredeux qui sont sortis de l'ignorance naturelle, et n'ont pu arriver à l'autre, ont quelque teinture de cette science suffisante, et font les entendus.

Ceux-là troublent le monde, et jugent plus mal de tout que les autres." It appears to us that civilized Europe is just now in this intermediate state; or perhaps is beginning to emerge from it, here and there, wherever there is most of enlightenment. The exact and abstract sciences have been studied with unexampled ardour during the last hundred years; and a spirit, analogous to the spirit of science, if not always the same, has displayed itself, more or less, in every field of mental exertion, Franklin's common sense, Bentham's utility, Hume's cold acuteness,—these are the indices to the spirit of the times that are going by. When we are told that Socrates declared the extent of his knowledge to be, that he knew nothing, we are ready to ascribe so mortifying a result to the infant state of science in his day; and to believe that, had Socrates lived in the nineteenth century, he would have exulted over the abundance of his acquirements. If Pascal re-echoes the same thought, we impute it to the fanaticism of that extraordinary man; thinking perhaps, that he is depreciating human knowledge, only that he may exalt revelation. Possibly we may be mistaken, and Pascal may be in the right; and if so, we may be sure that all our labouring after knowledge will only end in the discovery of our ignorance. In astronomy, for instance, men will go on sharpening their eyesight with improved telescopes, discovering the precise number of stars in the milky way, ascertaining that such a particular fixed star, instead of being only twenty million million miles distant, is twenty-one,—and gaining fresh knowledge of minutiæ like these: till at last it will occur to them, that all this is immaterial—that they know nothing about the *inhabitants* of those immense globes; a question, the interest of which sinks their trigonometry into nothingness. So in the other sciences. Our possible knowledge is so limited, that when we have reached its farthest boundary, we shall only sigh for new worlds to conquer. Society will come, then, to the "ignorance savante" of Pascal. Such a state of mind, in an individual, is certainly unfavourable to the development of "rationalism:" it is more likely to lead him to slight the desire for pure and abstract truth, as ending only in disappointment; and to cultivate the imaginative and poetical faculties of the mind in preference to the mere intellect. And such, no doubt, will be the prevailing disposition in communities which have reached this "learned ignorance." Perhaps the decay of metaphysics in England, and the new spirit that has come over the philosophy and literature of France, may be signs of the times.

We have dwelt upon this topic at some length, because Lord

Jeffrey's despondency, as to the future in store for religion and poetry, displays itself perpetually throughout the work. In his reviewal of M. Grimm's correspondence, he repeats the following sentiments with applause, as "just and interesting speculations."

"M. Grimm thinks that good and evil are pretty fairly distributed to the different generations of men; and if an age of philosophy be happier in some respects than one of ignorance and prejudice, there are particulars in which it is not so fortunate. Philosophy, he thinks, is the result of a certain experience and a certain maturity; and implies, in nations as well as in individuals, the extinction of some of the pleasures as well as the follies of early life. All nations, he observes, have begun with poetry and ended with philosophy—or rather have passed through the region of philosophy in their way to that of stupidity and dotage. They lose the poetical passion, therefore, before they acquire the taste for speculation; and with it they lose all faith in those illusions, and all interest in those trifles, which make the happiness of the brightest portion of our existence. If, in this advanced stage of society, men are less brutal, they are also less enthusiastic,—if they are more habitually beneficent, they have less warmth of affection. They are delivered indeed from the yoke of many prejudices, but at the same time deprived of many motives of action. They are more prudent, but more anxious,—are more affected with the general interests of mankind, but feel less for their neighbours; and, while curiosity takes the place of admiration, are more enlightened, but far less delighted with the universe in which they are placed.

"The effect of this philosophical spirit on the arts is evidently unfavourable on the whole. *Their* end and object is delight, and that of philosophy is truth; and the talent that seeks to instruct will rarely condescend to aim merely at pleasing. Racine and Moliere and Boileau were satisfied with furnishing amusement to such men as Louis XIV., and Colbert, and Turenne: but the geniuses of the present day pretend to nothing less than enlightening their rulers; and the same young men who would formerly have made their *debut* with a pastoral or a tragedy, now generally leave college with a new system of philosophy and government in their portfolios. The very metaphysical, prying, and expounding turn of mind that is nourished by the spirit of philosophy, unquestionably deadens our sensibility to those enjoyments which it converts into subjects of speculation. It busies itself in endeavouring to understand those emotions which a simpler age is contented with enjoying; and seeking, like Psyche, to have a distinct view of the sources of our pleasures, is punished, like her, with their instant extinction.

"Religion too, continues M. Grimm, considered as a source of enjoyment or consolation in this world, has suffered from the progress of philosophy, exactly as the fine arts and affections have done. It has no doubt become infinitely more rational, and less liable to atrocious perversions; but then it has also become much less enchanting and ecstatic

—much less prolific of sublime raptures, beatific visions, and lofty enthusiasm. It has suffered, in short, in the common disenchantment; and the same cold spirit which has chased so many lovely illusions from the earth, has dispeopled heaven of half its marvels and its splendours." —Vol. i. p. 358.

Lord Jeffrey thinks that European literature, in particular, is more likely to be retrograde than progressive, because modern poets and writers lie under the disadvantage of being obliged to avoid plagiarism; and are thus debarred from the use of many natural expressions and images, which are pre-occupied by those who went before them. *Pereant qui ante nos nostra dixerunt*, seems to be a favourite sentiment with him. The topic figures at great length in some of his reviewals of Sir Walter Scott's poetry; but his views may be summed up in the following extract:—

"The early Greeks had but one task to perform. They were in no danger of comparisons, or imputations of plagiarism; and wrote down whatever struck them as just and impressive, without fear of finding that they had been stealing from a predecessor. The wide world, in short, was before them, unappropriated and unmarked by any preceding footstep; and they took their way, without hesitation, by the most airy heights and sunny vallies; while those who came after, found it so seamed and crossed with tracks in which they were forbidden to tread, that they were frequently driven to make the most fantastic circuits and abrupt descents to avoid them."—Vol. i. p. 108.

The danger is surely overrated; and it is almost a proof of inferior abilities, to be very sensitive of it. Profound thinkers, and men of true genius, run no risk of such involuntary plagiarism: if they treat the most common, every-day subject, it acquires in their hands a new and characteristic beauty. No two minds are alike; each one has a pervading tone which distinguishes it from all others. Whoever, then, works out thoughts for himself in his brain, and expresses them naturally, must needs invest them with somewhat of originality. Perhaps we might say, indeed, that all the originality which can belong to ornamental literature, dwells in the expression of this peculiar tone: since every isolated phrase which a writer makes use of must be already known to his readers, or he would not be understood; and so must the general doctrines which he brings forward in support of his views, or they would not be readily acquiesced in. It is only in the combination of these phrases, and in the application of these general truths, that he can exhibit novelty. And every mind, which works for itself, combines and applies after a fashion of its own. Bat those

second or third rate authors, who, instead of taxing their own powers of thought, pick up shreds of reasoning and metaphor from books or conversation, and are content to manufacture them into a patchwork,—are not original, certainly; nor would have been, had they lived before the flood. And originality is equally beyond the reach of those, who, thinking for themselves, have not learned to speak as they think: and therefore do not present on paper a true image of their mind, but exhibit it distorted by affectation, or screwed into a shape which their theories have taught them to fancy most becoming.

It would perhaps not be difficult to exemplify this view from Lord Jeffrey's own style, which is a singular mixture of originality and common-place. He is original when he follows the bent of his own natural disposition; but never, when he strives after that mode of writing, which he had been led by the course of his studies to look upon as preferable. He is admirable when he indulges the lively good-humoured irony, the quiet humour, and the epigrammatic turn of language which characterize his lighter productions. But he emulated the full periods and melodious diction of the old English writers; and whenever he was really determined to excel, these were his models. This is intimated in many passages of the work. After noticing, for instance, the invariable sweetness, which, he says, often gives an air of art and a weariness to the compositions of Washington Irving, he proceeds:—

"It is very ill-natured in us, however, to object to what has given us so much pleasure; for we happen to be very intense and sensitive admirers of those soft harmonies of studied speech in which this author is so apt to indulge himself; and have caught ourselves, oftener than we shall confess, neglecting his excellent matter, to lap ourselves in the liquid music of his periods,—and letting ourselves flow passively down the mellow falls and windings of his soft-flowing sentences, with a delight not inferior to that which we derive from fine versification."—Vol. iv. p. 215.

And in the life of William Penn he says: "the language appears to us to be one of the most beautiful specimens of that soft and mellow English, which, with all its redundancy and cumbrous volume, has to our ears a richer and more pathetic sweetness than the epigrams and apothegms of modern times." And, throughout, he scarce ever misses an opportunity of sneering at 'flashes and epigrams,' or of eulogizing 'mellowness' or lamenting the absence of it. Swift is not mellow enough for him; and Dryden, who might have restored the old English style, in place of the French brilliancy and point, which was introduced after the Restoration,—is severely blamed

for having preferred the latter. These indications of his taste may perhaps account for much of the 'redundancy and cumbrous volume,' with which the reader is often wearied in Lord Jeffrey's own compositions. We need not suppose that he actually imitated the old writers whom he praises: still, the tenor of those praises shews very plainly what were his own opinions on the subject of composition; and he would no doubt aim at that mode of writing which he thought the best.

Without instituting any comparison between the abstract merits of the 'epigrammatic' and 'mellow' styles, we hold it to be perfectly clear that that which Lord Jeffrey preferred, was not so well suited to him as the other. The reason is obvious. The mode of composition adopted by those writers whose copiousness Lord J. admires—by Barrow, and Hooker, and Taylor, and Burton—is intimately connected with their mode of reasoning. And this last is such as Lord Jeffrey would have been neither able nor willing to imitate;—as he himself assures us, in a passage where he speaks of Bishop Warburton as being—

—"the last of our *great* divines,—the last, perhaps, of any profession, among us, who united profound learning with great powers of understanding, and, along with vast and varied stores of acquired knowledge, possessed energy of mind enough to wield them with ease and activity. The days of the Cudworths and Barrows—the Hookers and Taylors, are long gone by. Among the other divisions of intellectual labour to which the progress of society has given birth, the business of reasoning, and the business of collecting knowledge, have been, in a great measure, put into separate hands. Our scholars are now little else than pedants, and antiquaries, and grammarians,—who have never exercised any faculty but memory; and our reasoners are, for the most part, but slenderly provided with learning; or at any rate make but a slender use of it in their reasonings. Of the two, the reasoners are by far the best off; and upon many subjects have really profited by the separation. *Argument from authority is in general the weakest and the most tedious of all arguments;* and learning, we are inclined to believe, has more frequently played the part of a bully than of a fair auxiliary; and been oftener used to frighten people than to convince them,—to dazzle and overawe, rather than to guide and enlighten. A modern writer would not, if he could, reason as Barrow and Cudworth often reason: and every reader, even of Warburton, must have felt that his learning often encumbers rather than assists his progress; and like shining armour, adds more to his terrors than to his strength." —Vol. iv. p. 337.

Lord Jeffrey did not perceive, that when the practice of reasoning from authority was discarded, it became impossible to employ the means by which these old writers prevented

their long-winded harmony from growing tedious. Into their flowing and abounding periods there was always introduced a crowd of matter, subsidiary to, or suggested by the subject upon which they were engaged,—and consisting of quotations, or comparisons, or analogies, or other of the various methods in which men take counsel of the past. It often happens, indeed, that those very writers whom we should call wordy and tedious if our attention were monopolized by the main argument, are thought extremely concise by those who consider them, not merely as conducting that argument, but as pouring out, at the same time, the abundance of a well-stored brain. Thus, by constantly giving food to the reader's thought, they ensure an attention fixed enough on his part, and a perusal slow enough, to mark and enjoy the melody of the language. Lord Jeffrey overlooks this circumstance; and, while he conducts his argument at a slow pace like theirs, does not engage his hearers' attention with any such by-discourses. Their minds are unencumbered, and have leisure to repine at the slowness of the author's movements, and perpetually to anticipate what he is about to say. This causes them to read much too fast to notice any of the elegant cadences and musical intonations which have been provided for their enjoyment. There are really many such sweet-sounding periods to be met with in these volumes—but unluckily one seldom finds them out. For, in a rapid perusal, it is not so much the ear as the eye that is concerned: and it would be more to the purpose to provide fine type, than pleasing sounds. The language of eloquence is only effective, in written composition, when the sentiments which it clothes are impressive, and such as the mind dwells upon.

To turn from the author to the critic,—we are disposed to admire the fairness of Lord Jeffrey's opinions in general. It is necessary, indeed, to make allowance, constantly, for much exaggeration both of sentiment and expression. It is a too common fault to mistake exaggeration for emphasis: and perhaps the most admired writers, as well as painters, owe much of their popularity to a height of colouring not to be found in nature. Lord Jeffrey is rather too fond of bright lights and deep shades, and of strong contrasts,—as if he wrote for careless readers, and was afraid that otherwise he should be unable to make an impression on them. Then it is certainly true, that his impartiality has in many instances been unable to overcome personal feelings, and local prejudices. His inveterate antipathy to the 'Lake Poets' carries him often into injustice. We are not among the implicit admirers of those

poets: and fully concur in Lord Jeffrey's complaints of Coleridge's obscurity, Wordsworth's frequent childishness, and the tediousness and flag of interest which often hangs upon Southey. But they were poets, in the true sense of the word. They have done much for modern poetry, in discarding the elaborate pomp of language with which it was clogged, and in introducing a truer and a deeper love for the beauties of nature, and the simple every-day feelings of men. As far as we can consider them as forming a school of poetry, — possessing common attributes, and distinguished from their predecessors,—we may say that one of their characteristics was, their perceiving, and acting upon the perception, that poetry is not a thing of artifice, but of reality; that it has its prototype in human nature; and that, accordingly, poetical beauty must be sought for in the poet's own heart, not in rules drawn from the practice of his predecessors. If Wordsworth runs into the faults of vulgarity and childishness, there is at least this excuse for him: he has detected, even in the vulgar and the childish, a poetical beauty which springs from the heart, and is capable of touching the hearts of others. Southey, we think, only fails to interest because his sympathies are not, like those of most of his readers, confined to the human race; but he is capable of entering into the feelings of gods and demigods, glendoveers, spirits of the air and the waters—the creatures of his own ardent imagination: and his flight is too airy for common men to follow. For Coleridge's obscurity we are less ready to make excuse. Wilfully to throw darkness over his meaning, is no doubt a grave fault in any writer: to do so involuntarily, marks a confused intellect:—still, we would not place these Lake poets in the highest rank. They want the compression of language, and its cause, the intensity of thought and passion, which belong to genius such as that of Shakspeare or Milton. They can act upon their readers' feelings, but cannot carry them away. They can produce an enjoyment, analogous to that derived from a fair landscape, not from a grand historical picture,—from a pastoral, not a tragedy. They can give pleasure—but not that intensest pleasure, the way to which lies through pain. If it is true that, "our sweetest songs are those that tell of saddest thought," their songs are not the sweetest.

We are no very ardent admirers of Sir Walter Scott's poetry. Poetry is in its nature so far superior to prose, that the poetry, which was eclipsed by its author's prose writings, could not have been of the highest order. And Scott, with all his unrivalled power over the imagination, exerts, in his poems, very little power over the passions. His readers' minds, indeed, are filled with

sights of chivalrous splendour—picturesque scenes crowded with picturesque personages. But it is the gorgeousness of a pageant, rather than of actual life. We are led to think more of their dresses or of their armour,—of the peculiarities which distinguished the men of those days from ourselves, than of that which is common to us and to them—the human heart and its passions. The personages of the poem are so unlike those whom we have known, and been interested in, that we can feel no very lively sympathy for them. To some extent, the substance of Lord Jeffrey's criticism is perhaps just. But the tone of it is displeasing. There is a seeming want of candour in it; an appearance of being "willing to wound, but yet afraid to strike." The praises, while to the ear they sound very emphatic, have yet a lurking drawback: and the censures, with the appearance of good nature, imply a great deal more than they directly express. They leave an impression, as if the reviewer was unwilling, on account of personal friendship with the author, to speak as harshly as he feels he ought to do; an impression very similar to that which is made, and no doubt intended to be made, by Hume, whenever he apologizes for any of the doings of the Roundheads.

The same disingenuity is visible in the reviewal of Scott's life of Swift; in which, apparently because Scott had looked a little too much on the fair side of his character, Lord Jeffrey enters upon a violent invective against the Dean, magnifying his failings with all the bitterness of a partizan, and in our opinion, with great injustice. To be sure, as a deserter to the Tories, Swift's political views could expect no quarter from so zealous a liberal as his reviewer; but a difference in politics is surely no reason why due praise should not be given to his merit as a writer, and, with all his failings, as a man. The reviewal leaves one to suppose that Swift was utterly without principle and without heart —with talents that have been very much overrated, not being, in truth, much above mediocrity. We cannot believe a man to be without principle, whose charity to the poor—to speak of none of his other good qualities—was so constant as Swift's, and proceeded, not from a loose indifference to money—for he is reproached with avarice; nor from ostentation—for he is ridiculed as having been over-careful to avoid the display of any virtue or piety; but either, as we may surely infer, from a strong sense of duty, or from a benevolent heart.

There are several minor points on which we dissent from Lord Jeffrey's conclusions. We think him very unjust to Sterne, when he speaks of his "paltry flippancy and disgusting affectation"—unjust to Warburton, to Alfieri, to Curran and others.

But it cannot be denied that the views which he takes upon literary questions, are supported generally with very great ability, and have plausible grounds to rest upon. We do not now enter upon the political part of the work, because it relates mostly, of course, to by-gone questions, and has lost the greater part of the interest it once might have possessed. On the whole, these volumes contain much that is interesting, and much that is tedious: the great fault is the bulk: and with all their many merits, we quit them without reluctance.

L.

ART. III.—LIFE IN THE SICK ROOM. ESSAYS. By an Invalid. London: Moxon. 1844.

PRACTICAL SUGGESTIONS TOWARDS ALLEVIATING THE SUFFERINGS OF THE SICK. Third Edition. London: 1837.

THE old style of reviewing, which consisted in a careful and critical account of the actual contents of a book, might sometimes be revived with great advantage to the general reader. Periodical Literature should not only serve as a guide to the difficult task of Selection from the innumerable progeny of the press, and to form the public judgment on true principles of taste, but should also in some measure shorten the immense labour of reading, and supply to multitudes the place of the original works. There is indeed a difficulty here; for the books that are the richest in materials, and the most felicitous in execution, while they alone deserve such full and analytical reviews, are just those for which no review can be taken as a substitute. But, in fact, the most ample account of a really good book only serves to whet the appetite for it, and strengthen the desire of possession; and thus accomplishes the two purposes, of stimulating the curiosity of those who have the power to purchase and the time to read, and of conveying its substance to those with whom both time and money are articles to be most strictly economized.

"Life in the Sick Room," from the universal interest of its subject, the richness of its matter, and its managable compass, is eminently deserving of a review, the whole value of which is drawn from the book itself. Even our occasional differences with the Author would require us to adopt this course; for when a spirit, 'separated unto' God and itself, by sanctifying pain, professes to utter from the innermost shrine of life what it feels and knows, it is no time for those who write at ease, to apply the criticism of common views and common life to convictions and principles arrived at on the isthmus between Life and Death; and which, whether universally true or peculiar to the individual, are at all events, in this case at least, the results of a diviner experience than we have ever known. With those "who breathe their words in pain," and are endued with the purer insight of a sequestered soul, we should feel it rude and disrespectful to express a difference on the slightest point affecting spiritual life, without acknowledging that we are presuming, from amongst

the throng of the outer court, to discuss divine mysteries with one whom God's hand has drawn within the Holy of Holies; or without imparting as a necessary material of judgment, so far as they can disclose it to us, that peculiar experience from which they speak. An ordinary, critical, and summary account of such a work would be out of place, for it is the Report of a mind placed by God, for a season,—in the maturity of its powers, and after the misleading passions and imaginations, incident to all, have been calmed and rectified by experience and thoughtful wisdom,—in relations of peculiar intimacy to the spiritual realities of our existence.

The writer properly claims the privileges of this peculiar position, in imparting to its revelations something of the character of "spiritual discernment," and exempting them from exoteric criticism,—but we have felt several times, whilst reading the work, that a good deal of ordinary experience, or, we should rather say, of the convictions and insight of *all* thoughtful and spiritual minds, is apparently claimed as the peculiar fruit of a condition of sickness and suffering. Let us not be misunderstood. We doubt not there is no perception of the soul, no spiritual use of the senses, no feeling of the nearness of God, no conviction of the pervading presence of eternal Love, Beauty, and Order, that is not quickened, at times, to a mind sanctified and drawn home to one place of Rest, by a hand that shuts out the refuge of the world as it brings the sufferer nearer to itself, in a degree that is inconceivable by those who have no actual experience of the teachings of solitude and a life supported from within, when we are cut off, for ever, from all "refuges of lies," and left alone with our immortal sympathies. Much, we doubt not, of what the writer claims as the peculiar teaching of Sickness, consists in a new force, clearness, and calmness communicated to previously existing perceptions and convictions of the mind; and any attempt at faithfully describing the nature and extent of the change introduced into our views and sentiments of Life, by the moral and physical circumstances of long continued and hopeless Sickness would have been new knowledge and experience, so far as such experience can be imparted, of the most interesting kind. Instead, however, of this modification and quickening of existing convictions and sentiments, the writer, notwithstanding an occasional admission of their independent existence, too broadly claims them as absolutely the *peculiar property* of the Invalid, and gives us no information as to the influence which Sickness, as a new spiritual condition, exerts upon them. For the most part, "Life in the

Sick Room" is, in its views, very much Life as it appears to all earnest, calm, and meditative minds; and, though most elevated and true, neither gives us what we can accept as at all the peculiar fruits of Sickness, nor describes the effects of that condition on sentiments already derived from a different experience. If many of the Lessons contained in this book have come to the writer, for the first time, in a Sick Room, it is so far true to a single experience, and a most interesting case of individual history,—but whilst no one will read its pages without deep and respectful sympathy, many will feel that there are other positions besides that of Sickness, from which the spiritual observer sees Life lying before him in the same clear, tender, and solemn lights. In the Dedication a peculiar insight is claimed for the Invalid into the beneficent workings of Providence. It may be so, and we believe it is so,—but there is no attempt to exhibit this insight as growing out of the condition of Sickness, or as deriving some new feature from that Condition. Instead of this we have what all true minds feel and see, appropriated to the Invalid. We wish the writer had enlarged our spiritual knowledge by describing the *additions* made by Sickness to sentiments which are not peculiar to it.

"While we use our new insight to show us how things are done,—and gravely smile to see that it is by every man's overrating the issues of his immediate pursuit, in order that he may devote all his energies to it, (without which nothing would ever be done,) we smile with another feeling presently, on perceiving how an industry and care from above are compensating to every man his mistake by giving him collateral benefits, when he misses the direct good he sought,—by giving him and his helpers a wealth of ideas, as often as their schemes turn out, in their professed objects, profitless. When we see men straining every nerve to reach the tempting apples which are to prove dust and ashes in their jaws, we see also, by virtue of our position, the flying messenger who is descending with the ambrosia which is to feed their immortal part. We can tell that while revolutions are grandly operating, by which life and the world will in time change their aspect,—while a progress is advancing to which it is now scarcely conceivable that we should ever have dreamed of putting our hands,—there is not one of our passing thoughts that is not ordained,—not a sigh of weariness unheeded, not an effort of patience that is not met half way by divine pity,—not a generous emotion of triumph in the world's improvement that is not hallowed by the divine sympathy ever living and breathing round about us. This our peculiar privilege, of feeling and seeing something of the simultaneous vastness and minuteness of providential administration, is one in which we most enjoy sympathy;—at least I do:—and in this, therefore, do I find your undoubted fellowship most precious."—p. xiv.

Again there is an exquisite passage in which the transient na-

ture of pain and the permanent nature of Good are illustrated by the effects of a sunrise seen at a moment of Suffering. But the question arises, what was the connection of Sickness with the peculiar effects of that sunrise? The Suffering is called "the conditions of the gain," but the picture did not proceed from the pain, except in the mere accident of calling the wearied watcher to the window,—nor was in any sense its fruit and experience. Good is permanent, and pain transient, but, *what* is the good that *proceeds from* Pain? Much of the remembered effect of that sudden glimpse of God's glory must have depended on the mental and physical state of the Sufferer; the ordinary impression of such a scene must have been largely qualified by the peculiar insight and faculty of suffering,—and it is this addition to our spiritual knowledge which we ardently long to obtain from one who possesses the experience. The passage itself is too true, and too beautiful, to be omitted here, though it has no particular connexion with the insight of Sickness.

"For one instance, which will well illustrate what I mean, let us look back so far as the Spring, and take one particular night of severe pain, which made all rest impossible. A short intermission, which enabled me to send my servant to rest, having ended in pain, I was unwilling to give further disturbance, and wandered, from mere misery, from my bed and my dim room, which seemed full of pain, to the next apartment, where some glimmer through the thick window-curtain, showed that there was light abroad. Light indeed! as I found on looking forth. The sun, resting on the edge of the sea, was hidden from me by the walls of the old priory: but a flood of rays poured through the windows of the ruin, and gushed over the waters, strewing them with diamonds, and then across the green down before my windows, gilding its furrows, and then lighting up the yellow sands on the opposite shore of the harbour, while the market garden below was glittering with dew, and busy with early bees and butterflies. Besides these bees and butterflies, nothing seemed stirring, except the earliest riser of the neighbourhood, to whom the garden belongs. At the moment, she was passing down to feed her pigs, and let out her cows; and her easy pace, arms a-kimbo, and complacent survey of her early greens, presented me with a picture of ease so opposite to my own state, as to impress me ineffaceably. I was suffering too much to enjoy this picture at the moment: but how was it at the end of the year? The pains of all those hours were annihilated—as completely vanished as if they had never been; while the momentary peep behind the window-curtain made me possessor of this radiant picture for evermore. This is an illustration of the universal fact. That brief instant of good has swallowed up long weary hours of pain. An inexperienced observer might, at the moment, have thought the conditions of my gain heavy enough; but the conditions being not only discharged, but annihilated long ago, and the treasure remaining

for ever, would not my best friend congratulate me on that sunrise? Suppose it shining on, now and for ever, in the souls of a hundred other invalids or mourners, who may have marked it in the same manner, and who shall estimate its glory and its good!"—p. 7.

The work is dedicated to an anonymous and, if we infer rightly, an unknown fellow-sufferer, with whom the writer cherishes the belief of no common sympathy. There is something mysterious in the Dedication, which raises a doubt whether it has a general or an individual direction. We believe the latter to be the truth, though there is something very pleasing and soothing in the thought of the wearied mind taking refuge with all fellow-sufferers, diverting the sense of pain, and freshening the heart, by realizing for them, as for one's self, the consolations of God. What 'a household of God,' this communion of sufferers, each tenderly remembering the other, and eager even to dismiss the Angel, that he may carry his comfort elsewhere!

"In our wakeful night-seasons, when the healthy and the happy are asleep, we may call to each other from our retreats, to know each how the other fares; and, whether we are at the moment dreary or at peace, it may be that there are angels abroad (perhaps the messengers of our own sympathies), who may bear our mutual greetings, and drop them on their rounds. Often has this been my fancy, when the images close about me have been terrific enough; and when, in the very throng of these horrors, I have cast about for some charm or talisman wherewith to rid myself of them, and some voice of prayer has presently reached me from a temple on the farthest horizon of my life—or some sweet or triumphant hymn of submission or praise has floated to my spirit's ear from the far shores of my childhood—I have hoped, in the midst of the heaven thus brought down about me, that the same consolations were visiting you, who in the same need would, I knew, make the same appeal."—p. x.

The first Essay on 'the Transient, and the Permanent in a Sick Room,' should bear the heading 'Good and Pain,' rather than Good and Evil, for there is no attempt in it to prove the transitory nature of any Evil except physical suffering. And even this we fear is only an individual experience, and that many are the sufferers with whom their pain assumes a terrible distinctness,—and when not actually present with them disturbs every moment with the fearful apprehension of return. It would be a great mistake to assume that one's own case was the common type of human agony. The writer is not quite consistent even in his own testimony to the transitoriness of pain. There are melancholy acknowledgments of its permanent

effects. "The mind, though clear and active, has been so far affected by the bodily state as to lose all its gaiety, and, by disuse, almost to forget its sense of enjoyment." The language used would seem to imply that all evil was considered transitory in its nature, but this Doctrine would not be true nor safe; and there are other passages in the work which show that this was not the author's fixed intention.

"One of the most painful trials of long sickness and seclusion is, that all old pains, all past moral sufferings, are renewed and magnified; that in sleepless nights, and especially on waking in the morning, every old sin and folly, and even the most trifling error, rises up anew, however long ago repented of and forgiven, and, in the activity of ordinary life, forgotten. Any sort of ghost is more easily laid than this kind."—p. 21.

There is some confusion made between physical and moral evil in the following passage:

"It is no contradiction, that some are soured by suffering. Their pains, like mine, are gone; and with them, as with others, it is ideas which remain; and ideas are essentially good, a part of the indestructible inner life which must, from its very nature, sooner or later part with its evil, through experience of the superabounding good of the Universe. If one so soured by pain dies in this mood, the ideal part of him is that which remains to be carried into a fresh scene, where the mood cannot be fed by the experience which nourished it here."—p. 9.

Here it is said that the ideas of one soured by suffering are essentially good,—and that when he dies, the pains are gone for ever, and only the ideal part of him remains. But this 'ideal part' consists of a mind 'soured by pain.' The speculation respecting the providential treatment of such a mind in fresh scenes we believe to be just, but we see in it no proof of the transient nature of Evil, nor alas! even of Pain, if it assumes the moral form of a soured mind, and works spiritual evil.

There is an admirable Essay, perhaps the best in the book, on 'Sympathy to the Invalid;' though on many points it will be felt that too absolute a Rule has been founded on an individual experience which includes neither all forms of mind, nor all forms of suffering. Indeed we are constantly reminded of the apparent unconsciousness of the Author that the experience described, especially with regard to the concomitants of Sickness, both physical and moral, is decidedly of the exceptional kind. How many are the sufferers who, except in the sad fellowship of pain, could recognize nothing of their own case! Fathers whose families may want bread whilst the working brain burns with fever, or the strong right hand lies powerless;

wives,—mothers,—laid apart from their husbands, their children, and their households,—their occupation in life taken away, whilst yet its duties are incapable of being discharged by another,—their noblest work appearing to them to be on earth however submissively their wills may be God's,—these will look upon the face of Death with different feelings, and need a different sympathy and treatment from those which are entirely proper to the case presented in this book, that of an Invalid apparently with no peculiar charge, and, however closely and tenderly allied, directly accountable to God, only for his own talents and his own soul. The peculiar form of the malady, and of the mental constitution of the sufferer must, also, largely modify the kind of sympathy to be administered, as well as the manner, and even the measure, in which truths of fact, relating to their state, should be communicated. Who could say, who *ought* to say, to a *consumptive* patient, with the love of life clinging to the heart, "Why should we be bent upon your being better, and make up a bright prospect for you? I see no brightness in it; and the time seems past for expecting you ever to be well." Such an announcement would unquestionably often shorten life, and sometimes destroy it on the spot. Yet we cannot enter this qualification without expressing our strong sympathy with the general principle of the author, and our veneration for every mind that desires, and is able, to hear the exact truth. This power, indeed, of hearing the truth, in such extremity, is not always to be accounted as matter for individual praise, but rather as the gift of God.

There can be no attestation to truths that relate to peculiar states of existence so strong as a common experience; and we have witnessed the suffering, and even the resentment, produced by a description of rude and false sympathy, which the author most properly condemns, as superficial and unfeeling.

"Going back to the days when I, myself, was the sympathizer, I remember how strong is the temptation to imagine, and to assure the sick one, that his pain will not last; that the time will come when he will be well again; that he is already better; or, if it be impossible to say that, that he will get used to his affliction, and find it more endurable. How was it that I did not see that such offers of consolation must be purely irritating to one who was not feeling better, nor believing that he should ever be better, nor in a state to be cheered by any speculation as to whether his pain would, or would not become more endurable by time! Exactly in proportion to the zeal with which such considerations were pressed, must have been the sufferer's clearness of perception of the disguised selfishness which dictated the topics and the words. I was (as I half suspected at the time, from my sense of restraint and

uneasiness,) trying to console myself and not my friend; indulging my own cowardice, my own shrinking from a painful truth, at the expense of the feelings of the sufferer for whom my heart was aching."—p. 14.

The Author, in condemning a kind of consolation which no doubt is often very weakly and falsely offered, is led to state a general doctrine respecting the functions of Conscience which, we think, does not truly represent the religious or spiritual relations of the moral sense to the peace of the mind.

"I am here reminded of a sort of consolation, often offered, which I do not at all understand. I do not quarrel with it however, for it may suit others less insensible to its claims. Sequestered sufferers, whose term of activity is over, and who apparently have only to endure as they may, and learn and enjoy what they can, till they receive their summons to enter a new career, are referred for solace to their consciences—to their consciousness of services rendered to society, and duty done in active days. I strongly doubt whether Conscience was ever appointed to the function of Consoler; I more than doubt; I disbelieve it. According to my own experience, the utmost enjoyment that Conscience is capable of is a negative state, that of ease. Its power of suffering is strong; and its natural and best condition I take to be that of simple ease; but for enjoyment and consolation, I believe we must look to other powers and susceptibilities of our nature."—p. 19.

It is most true that Conscience ought to administer no direct consolations, or, rather we should say, enjoyments, for a legitimate consolation under the temporary defeats of Liberty and Truth may be derived from a well-earned conviction that no unfaithfulness of ours had contributed to the failure, and that God's good time was not yet come. None but the emptiest fool will feast himself with self-praise, or succeed in the attempt to regard with complacency his own heart or his own life. But still, is it not Conscience that removes all obstructions to the consolations of God, and suffers a divine peace to settle upon us? Is it not Conscience that permits the true Consoler to have access to us?

The "Comforter" is our Father's spirit, but to those only whose hearts are right with him, is he enabled to manifest himself,—to come to them and make His abode with them. Conscience *is* the Consoler, for by withdrawing the moral obstacle, it suffers God to comfort.

It may be that the Author only meant to protest against self-approbation as a source of happiness, without denying that a pure Conscience was an indispensable requisite, an invariable antecedent to the action of the true Consoler. But if this was the intention, we think the doctrine is not carried far enough, for we cannot admit even a negative state of enjoyment to the

action of Conscience, if introduced as a Consoler. If Conscience is directly consulted at all, it must, except to the most vulgar minds, give an answer of positive dissatisfaction; it must show us our Ideal and our Actual in painful and shameful severance, and leave us not a pretext for believing that our moral condition admits of any explanation but that of wilful unfaithfulness. Yet wherever Conscience *works*, without stopping to reflect upon itself, or enjoy the thought of its own fidelity, God brings a divine peace even on its imperfect states; and when sequestered from service, by an act of His providence, still its inner peace, except in morbid cases, will continue to be unconsciously derived from the action of His spirit on pure, earnest, loving states of the heart, and will know no material disturbance from unhealthy retrospection. There is nothing in the statements of our Author inconsistent with these views, but they struck us as considering Conscience in a light too human and self-dependent, as not bringing, with sufficient distinctness, its functions as Consoler into immediate connection with the Spirit of God.

The mention of a consolation which is ever likely to be offered only to the very few, and which none, one would think, endowed with the power to render any true service to mankind, could be capable either of using or abusing, takes away, to our feeling, something of the elevated sentiment of the book, and presents the writer as one of a small and distinguished class, instead of the common brotherhood of mankind,—still the manner in which such offered consolation is received is so just and admirable, and leads to so prompt a recognition of the only fountain of living waters, that the passage may fairly be regarded as, in effect, supplying whatever was deficient in the view previously given of the functions of Conscience, as a Consoler.

"To have one's friends come, and desire one to look back upon one's past life for complacency and self-gratulation, in order to assure one's self how well one has used one's powers and opportunities,—how much one has done for society—how lofty and honourable a life one has led—and so forth,—O! what words can express the absurdity! If the consoler could but see the invisible array which comes thronging into the sick room from the deep regions of the past, brought by every sound of nature without, by every movement of the spirit within; the pale lips of dead friends whispering one's hard or careless words, spoken in childhood or youth—the upbraiding gaze of duties slighted and opportunities neglected—the horrible apparition of old selfishness and pusillanimities—the disgusting foolery of idiotic vanities; if the consoler could catch a momentary glimpse of this phantasmagoria of the sick room, he would turn with fear and loathing from the past, and shudder, while the inured invalid smiles, at such a choice of topics for consolation.

"Then it might become the turn of the invalid to console—to explain how these are but phantoms—how solace does abound, though it comes from every region rather than the kingdom of Conscience—and how, while the past is dry and dreary enough, there are streams descending from the heaven-bright mountain-tops of the future, for ever flowing down to our retreat, pure enough for the most fastidious longing, abundant enough for the thirstiest soul. The consoler may then learn for life how easily all personal complacencies may be dispensed with, while the sufferer can tell of a true 'refuge and strength,' and 'present help,' and of this 'river that gladdens the city of God,' and flows to meet us as we journey towards it."—p. 23.

A severe truth would object to the statement in this passage, that these hauntings from the past *are phantoms*,—and not rather the just perceptions of unbiassed, unembodied Conscience,—though doubtless they are often the products of disease in the purest natures, and most frequently so where the moral sensibility is of the tenderest kind. On the other hand we cannot, at all, sympathize with the sentiment that there is no just source of joy in the feeling, that *we* have been made the means of blessing to mankind,—and that our joy would be as great, nay greater, if the same service had been rendered by another. That there is no just cause of self-praise we admit, but surely there is just cause for deep, overflowing gratitude to God, the purest of all joy, that He has given it to *us*, to be in the given case, the representative of His love. This joy seems to us the real dictate both of true humility, and of true thankfulness of heart.

There are some examples given of the true sympathy offered by "the archangels of consolation who, at the fitting moment, remind us of our true calling." There are in these, single expressions which we might wish reduced into formal harmony with the spirit of religious *dependence*, which is really their suggesting and sustaining sentiment; and we notice this only to deprecate cavilling about words.

"If the friend of my brighter days—with whom I have travelled, sung, danced, consulted about my work, enjoyed books and society—the friend, now far off, busy in robust health of body, and spirit, sends me a mission which says, 'You languish—you are sick at heart. But put this sickness from your heart, and your pains under your feet. You have known before that there is a divine joy in endurance. Prove it now. Lift up your head amidst your lot, and wait the issue—not submissively but heroically. Live out your season, not wistfully looking out for hope, or shrinking from fear: but serenely and immoveably (because in full understanding with God), ENDURE;' if such an appeal comes, and at any hour (for there is no hour of sickness with which it is not congenial), what an influx of life does it bring! What a heavenly day, week, year, succeeds! How the crippled spirit leaps up at the mi-

raculous touch, and springs on its way, praising God in his very temple! And again when a thoughtful, conscientious spirit, guided by an analytical intellect, utters from a distance, not as an appeal, but as a soliloquy—'With an eternity before us, it cannot matter much, if we would but consider it,—whether we are laid aside for such or such a length of time; whether we can be busy for others at this moment, or must wait so many months or years; and as for ourselves, how can we tell but that we shall find the experience we are gaining worth any cost of suffering?' When such a thought comes under my eye, as if I heard some spirit in the night wind communing with itself, I feel a strong and kindly hand take my heart and steep it in patience. Again, a kind visitor, eloquent by using few words or none on matters nearest at heart, takes down from my shelves a Fenelon or other quietist, and with silent finger points to the saying, inexhaustible in truth, that it is what we *are* that matters—not what we *do*; and here, in one moment, do I find a boundless career opened to me within the four walls of my room. Again—a tender spirit, anxious under responsibility, says, 'If you could but fully feel, as you will one day feel, the privilege of having your life and lot settled for you—your spirit free, your mind at leisure—no hurry, no conflicts or misgivings about duty—you would easily conceive that there are some who would gladly exchange with you, and pour into your lap willingly all the good things that you seem to be without. I dare say we are very philosophical for you about your sufferings; but where I do sympathise with you, is in regard to this clearness and settledness of your life's duty and affairs.' To this again, my whole being cries 'amen!' Here are a few of the heavenly messages which have come to me through human hearts."—p. 29.

All Invalids, and all who may be Invalids, are indebted to the Author of 'Life in the Sick Room,' for the distinctness with which it speaks of the unintentional severity with which a sufferer, who has lost the reckoning of time, and even the power of bringing any labour or fatigue of others into comparison with his own pains, may press upon the strength of the most affectionate attendants, and injure the love of survivors by inconsiderate demands which, though proceeding from absolute ignorance, and known so to do yet, produce the impression of selfishness on the exhausted frame of the most devoted friendship.

"There is one point on which I can speak only as every one may,—from observation and thought,—but on which I have a very decided impression notwithstanding;—as to the conduct which would be dictated by the truest sympathy in a case which not unfrequently occurs. I have known instances of persons, most benevolent and thoughtless of themselves through life, becoming *exigeans* and oppressive in their last days, merely through want of information as to what they are doing. One attendant is usually preferred to all others by a dying person; and I have seen the favourite nurse worn out by the incessant service required day

and night by the sufferer, in ignorance how time passes,—even in mistake of the night for the day. I have known the most devoted and benevolent of women call up her young nurse from a snatch of sleep at two in the morning to read aloud, when she had been reading aloud for six or seven hours of the preceding day. I have known a kind hearted and self denying man require of two or three members of his family to sit and talk and be merry in his chamber, two or three hours after midnight:—and both for want of a mere intimation that it was night, and time for the nurse's rest. How it makes one shudder to think of this being one's own case! The passing doubt whether one can trust one's friends, when the season comes, to save one from such tyrannical mistakes, is a doubt sickening to the heart. Nothing is clearer *now*, when we are in full possession of ourselves, than that the most sympathising friend is one who cherishes our amiability and reasonableness to the last,—who preserves our perfect understanding with those about us through all dimness of the eyes and wandering of the brain. If I could not trust my friends to save me from involuntary encroachment at last, I had rather scoop myself a hole in the sand of the desert, and die alone, than be tended by the gentlest hands, and soothed by the most loving voices in the choicest chamber."—p. 41.

The blessed influences of Nature to the Invalid are described with the most touching truth; nor would it be possible to exaggerate the healing value of this grace of God, as our Author calls it, to the sick and the languishing. It is indeed God's own medicine for the weary and the longing. Some of the sketches of scenery, with living figures, read rather like compositions when the pen was in the hand, than as the impressions given off at once to the mind,—but this may not be so, and at all events, only Nature's own sights and images could suggest the healthy thoughts and feelings which weave into a charming little history of cheerful and sociable incidents, a few chance glimpses of a farmer on a horse. Next to nature, the books that treat of nature, that fill the mind with vivid images of external things, are the greatest refreshments to the invalid. How tenderly, though unintentionally, are the writer's wants and states commended, and perfectly revealed, to our sympathies, in the following passage, which our experience, so far as experience can come by observation, most fully verifies!

"Blessings on the writers of voyages and travels; and not the less for their not having contemplated our case in describing what they have seen! A schoolboy's or a soldier's eagerness after voyages and travels is nothing to that of an invalid. We are insatiable in regard to this kind of book. To us it is scenery, exercise, fresh air. The new knowledge is quite a secondary consideration. We are weary of the aspect of a chest of drawers,—tired of certain marks on the wall, and of many unchangeable features of our apartment; so that when a morning comes,

and our eyes open on these objects, and we foresee the seasons of pain or bodily distress, or mental depression, which we know must come round as regularly as the hours, we loathe the prospect of our day. Things clear up a little when we rise, and we think we ought to be writing a letter to such-a-one, which has been on our conscience for some time. While the paper and ink are being brought, we put out our hand for that book,—arrived or laid in sight this morning. It is a Journal of Travels to the Polar Sea, or over the Passes of the Alps,—or in the Punjâb,—or in Central or South America. Here the leaves turn over rapidly;—there we linger, and read one paragraph again and again, dwelling fondly on some congregation of images, to be seen by our bodily eyes no more:—on we go till stopped by the fluttering and distress,—the familiar pain or the leaden downsinking of the spirits, and wonder that our trying time has come so soon, before the letter is written. It has not come soon;—it is only that some hours of our penance have been beguiled,—that we have been let out of our prison for a holiday, and are now brought back to our schooling. But the good does not end here. We see everything with different eyes,—the chest of drawers,—the walls,—the book-shelves, and the pattern of the rug. We have been seeing the Northern Lights and icebergs: we have been watching for avalanches, or for the sunrise from Etna, or gazing over the Pampas, or peering through the primeval forest; and fragments of these visions freshen the very daylight to us."—p. 60.

The Essay 'Life to the Invalid,' though containing many thoughts of great interest, does not extend our knowledge of the Insight of Sickness. We therefore pass over many inviting topics for the sake of the more peculiar experience of an Invalid. We cannot however omit the testimony it gives to the supremacy of moral interests, whenever the mind is for a moment separated from the hurry and bewildering excitement of life. Are there no minds clear enough, no hearts true enough, to bear witness to the same simple and majestic truths, in the midst of Life, calmly insensible to all its flurry, pride, meanness, and intoxication?

"It requires that we should live in the midst of the arrangements of Society, that our conventional ideas should be nourished by daily associations, in order to keep up even the remembrance of differences of hereditary rank, so overpowering in our view are the great interests of life which are common to all,—Duty, Thought, Love, Joy, Sorrow, and Death.——

"In truth in our retreat moral considerations are all in all. Moral distinctions are the chief; and moral interests, common to all, are supreme. They are so from their essential nature, and they are so to us especially, from the singular advantage of our position for seeing their beauty, and the abundance of it. We could make known—what is little suspected by busy stirrers in the world, and wholly disbelieved by despondent moralists who dwell amidst its apparent confusion—that

there is a deep heaven lying inclosed in the very centre of Society, and a genuine divinity residing in the heart of every member of it, which might, if we would but recognize it, check our longing to leave the present scene, to search for God and Heaven elsewhere."—pp. 99-101.

We doubt not that every moral perception becomes wonderfully clear in the 'sequestration' of the Invalid, partly from the calm, the 'dry light,' of the surrounding circumstances,—and partly from a softening and purification of the spiritual eye. We do not therefore question the substantial truth of the following statement, though it might be more unexceptionably put. There is some extravagance of expression in the few words we have italicized.

"Let any one recall what it is to feel suddenly, by personal experience, the full depth of meaning of some saying, always believed in, often repeated with sincerity, but never till now *known*. Every one has felt this, in regard to some one proverb, or divine scriptural clause, or word of some right royal philosopher or poet. Let any one then try to conceive of an extension of this realization *through all that has ever been wisely said of man and human life, and he will be endeavouring to imagine our experience.*"—p. 66.

In the Essay 'Death to the Invalid,' it is said that the strongest evidence of the Immortality of the Soul is afforded by the deep conviction, nay sense, of its own inextinguishable vitality in the midst of bodily decay, "when there can be no deception from animal spirits, or from immediate sympathy with other minds, or from what is called the natural desire for life." An attestation of this kind, from one who has long felt that God is loosening the cords of 'the earthly tent-house,' and almost seen 'the house not made with hands' through its thin, transparent walls, we solemnly accept as an invaluable portion of spiritual experience. Whether universal or not, it is the intimate apprehension and conviction of one calm, earnest, profound mind weighed down with physical infirmity, and drawing its sense of life from the soul alone. But this experience is not singular. The flame is independent of the perishing lamp. The love that burns undimmed when life yields nothing but suffering can have no connection with sense or selfishness. Here is the sacred attestation, which no one can have a right to gainsay, of one who has long steadily gazed at Death, and beheld an Angel's face.

"All attempt at description is here vain. Nothing but experience can convey a conception of the intense reality in which God appears supreme, Christ and his gospel divine, and holiness the one worthy aim and chief good, when our frame is refusing its offices, and we can lay

hold on no immediate outward support and solace. It is conceivable to the healthy and happy, that, if waked up from sleep by a tremendous earthquake, the first recoil of terror might be followed by an intense perception of the fixity and tranquillity of the spiritual world, in immediate contrast with the turbulence of the outward and lower scene. It is conceivable to us all that the drowning man may, as is recorded, see his whole life, in all its minute details, presented to him, as in clear vision, in one instant of time, as he lapses into death. Well,—something like both these experiences is that of extreme and dissolving pain, to a certain order of minds. The vision and the attestation are present, without the horrors caused, amidst an earthquake, by the misery of a perishing multitude, though at the cost of more bodily anguish than in the case of the drowning man. Though there may be keen doubts in a modest sufferer how long such anguish can be decently endured,—whether the filial submission will hold out against torment,—there is, through, above, and beyond such doubts, so overpowering an impression of the vitality of the conscious part of us, and of the reality of the highest objects for which it was created and has lived,—so inexpressible a sense of the value of what we have prayed for, and of the evanescence of what we are losing,—that it is no wonder if the dying have been known to call for aid in their thanksgivings, and to struggle for sympathy even in their incommunicable convictions. If the shadows of the dark valley part, and disclose to such an one the regions that lie in the light of God's countenance, it is no wonder that he calls on those near him to look and see, though he is making the transit alone."—p. 112.

The idea is thrown out, in this Essay, that it is the inextinguishable, and sometimes oppressive belief in our immortality, the overpowering sense of an inability to die, which often prevents suicide from being resorted to, as a refuge from the weariness of dull and protracted suffering. We have known those who in long weariness have become indifferent to existence, and whose belief in immortality had faded from vivid confidence into calm and almost listless submission to God's will, an acquiescent faith that he would give eternal life if it was best for us, but with no certainty as to the fact: yet never did the thought of terminating life voluntarily cross the mind, except in the mere speculative form of a possible refuge from exhaustion and distress. Besides we doubt whether the future life ever appears to any mind in intimate association with that same weariness and suffering, from which we would escape here. There is something in the mere act of looking forward that emancipates from the toils and trammels of the present, and hardly any man transfers, in imagination, the cares and burdens of his actual position to the future of his life. Whatever may be the true, perhaps the secret, cause, we believe there is something in our natural feeling which, except in cases of disease,

prevents even the *thought* of suicide occurring to the sufferer, and that very seldom indeed is it a contemplated *act* from which he is dissuaded by reasoning and conviction. It is that our habits of feeling, our associations with life, and with its solemn, awful, and mysterious privileges as God's direct gift, suppress the idea, and not that any conviction, religious or otherwise, wrestles with and conquers the *entertained* idea. Of course any direct experience to the contrary would be decisive in the particular case, but none such is asserted.

The feelings with which the 'trembler on the brink' contemplates the final change, though they proceed from that inner experience with which the stranger cannot intermeddle, will make many a heart, untried yet by the reality, a grateful participator in their elevation and sacred peace, and better prepared for the hour which none are to escape.

"As for our real future home,—the scene where our living selves are to be,—how is it possible that we should not be often resorting thither in imagination, when it is to be our next excursion from our little abode of sickness and helplessness,—when it is so certain that we cannot be disappointed of it, however wearily long it may be before we go,—when all that has been best in our lives, our sabbaths, all sunset evenings and starry nights, all our reverence and love that are sanctified by death,—when all these things have always pointed to our future life and been associated with it, how is it possible that we should not be ever looking forward to it, now when our days are low and weary, and our pleasures few? The liability is to too great familiarity with the subject. When our words make children look abashed, and call a constraint over the manners of those we are conversing with, and cause even the most familiar eyes to be averted, we find ourselves reminded that the subject of a person's death is one usually thought not easy to discuss with him. In our retirement, we are apt to forget, till expressly reminded, the importance of distinctions of rank and property in society, so nearly as they vanish in our survey of life, in comparison with moral differences; and, in like manner, we have to recal an almost lost idea, that death is an awkward topic, except in the abstract, when our casual mention of a will, or of some transaction to follow our death, introduces an awe and constraint into the conversation.

"Such familiarity may be, and often is, condemned as presumptuous. There may be cases in which it is so; but I think it would be hard to make the censure general. The confident reckoning on the joys of heaven for one's self, on any grounds, while others are supposed to be condemned to a contrary lot, is a superstition more offensive to my feelings than that which renders a trembling soul, clinging to life, aghast at the idea of meeting its Maker and Father. But a soul without any self-complacency, or ignorant confidence, may yet be easy and eager in the prospect of entering upon that awful new scene. Setting aside all the inducements from the hope of relief and rest, the humblest spirit

may be conceived of as tranquil and aspiring in full view of the transition; and this under a full sense of its sins and failures, and without reliance on any imaginary security,—without need of other reliance than its Father in Heaven. There may be—there is—in some, so continual a regard to God in life, that there cannot seem anything very new and strange in going anywhere where He is. There may be—and there is—in some, so earnest a desire to be purified from sin, that they would undergo anything on earth to be freed from it, and therefore fear nothing, but rather welcome any discipline which may be reserved beyond. Knowing that the revelation of the evil of their sin must be most painful, but also most necessary to their progress, they are ready, even eager for it, pressing forward to the suffering through which they hope to be made perfect. If with such dispositions is joined that ardent, reverential filial love which generates perfect trust, and rejects any interposition between itself and the benign countenance in whose light it lives, there may be nothing blameable or dangerous in the readiness for death, or in the happy familiarity with which the event may be spoken of. It is a case in which every man should be slow to judge his neighbour, while the natural verdict of thoughtful observers would seem to be that a sufferer under irremediable illness, who preserves a general patience, cares for others' happiness more than his own, and has always lived in view of an eternal life, can hardly be wrong in anticipating that life with ease and cheerfulness, whatever analysis or judgment dogmatists may make of his state of mind."—p. 117.

The Essay on Temper, with a true wisdom, treats more of those secret evils which the Invalid alone has experience of, than of those more easily imagined difficulties which men in robust health, conceiving the irksomeness of their own feelings if, taking them as they are, they were to be placed in a state of confinement and seclusion, are apt to attribute to the sick. The most serious of these is the loss of self-respect which the morbid retrospect of past life, and the sense of present uselessness have a tendency to introduce even into the most patient, pious, and trustful mind,—however beneficent may have been the course of its former existence. The best remedy for this depressing frame is that which is suggested in the Essay on the 'Power of Ideas in the Sick Room,'—gentle trust in God who has left the isolated one no *choice* of his lot, supported by the conviction, the intuition, "that it matters infinitely less what we *do* than what we *are*." This conviction has broken with such new force on the Author's eminently practical mind, casting about for the urgent Duties of its position, that he longs to breathe it into every prisoner's ear. Certainly the dungeon and the Sick-room are the places where its light is most needed,—though it shines not there alone but wherever there are, (and where are there not?), talents; seeds of intellectual glory; powers of thought,

knowledge, service,—aspirations, to which the outward lot affords no encouragement, and even, except to the wisest, interdicts as unpractical. There is no great truth more familiar to reflective men than that what we are, not what we do, is God's chief care,—though it will come as a new and blessed revelation when most needed, to the prisoners of the Lord. Still it is no less true that by their *fruits* shall ye know them,—and that every word of God, which dwells within a man, must be made manifest in the flesh.

Among the Trials of temper appertaining to the Sick, one is hardly prepared to find the impatience said to be generated against slow, biassed, and perplexed thinkers by the 'improved insight and foresight' of the sequestered Invalid. There may readily, indeed, take place a divarication of sentiment between the eager man of practical life and the thoughtful mind withdrawn from affairs,—but it is more than doubtful whether it would be at all salutary that any exchange of views should take place between them. The sequestered mind may see a practical question from a more elevated point of view; and yet the view taken may be not true to the actual circumstances, and, if attempted to be applied, would retard the interests involved, without a revolution in the opinions and habits of mankind. Sequestered minds may make moral estimates with a truth and purity not attainable by the biassed and the busy: but when they think they could give a wiser direction to affairs, they forget the insuperable obstacle presented by the fact that the world would have no sympathy with their views, and obstinately follow its own. We all perhaps think that we could give a wiser direction to affairs, if we possessed a talismanic power of changing the opinions and biasses of other minds. But men will think and act according to their fitnesses; and often when we think ourselves very right on some social question and eager to inform the world of our view,—we are only supposing that we could construct marble palaces with bricks. There must however be much conceded to a claim, which a clear and powerful mind feels so confidently, and states so ably:—

"Far removed from the little triumphs or disappointments of the day, which warp the judgments of all men who have hearts to feel, whatever may be their abstract wisdom; endowed with long night hours of wakefulness, when our spirit of Humanity is all alive; permitted sequestered days, when our review of historical periods may be continuous, and when some great new idea, a stalactite of long formation, at length descends to our level, and touches our heads, or a diamond of thought, slowly distilled, drops into our hand as we penetrate and explore;—when some such gain—the guerdon of our condi-

tion—is frequently occurring, it cannot be but that, unless we are fools, our judgments of things must be worth something more than formerly. If formerly we associated with our equals, it cannot be but that we must now see further than they, in such questions of time as interest us."—p. 141.

Nothing is more remarkable, more admirable, in this book, than the healthy moral tone that breathes out of sickness. The Author suffers no egotism of position to pervert a former judgment, no suffering or difficulty to annul or suspend a spiritual requirement. There is the same severe demand from the mind, of faithfulness to all its highest convictions, of conformity to all its rules of duty, to all its noblest and most self-denying purposes, as could have been exacted in its most vigorous days of undimmed energy. The forms of duty and obedience may alter,—the spirit and principle, once truly seen, know no change. To do all God's will, in the spot where God's hand holds us, is the one desire of the filial mind. The trust, submission, and obedience, within the sphere He appoints, are its,—the connections of all this with the welfare, training, and instruction of the sufferer, and all whom the sufferer influences, are His care. Yet with all this firm spirit maintained in sickness, there is no sickly sentiment that suffering and affliction are God's only or best means of Grace,—or that their condition is privileged above their fellows,—or that the chastened only are God's loved ones. Considering the scope and purpose of the book, we are inclined to think that the following is the noblest passage in it, because exhibiting the Author's mind as proof against the self-regarding temptations of its position.

"When the nature of the process has been sufficiently dwelt upon to be understood—that the hearts of the happy may be duly softened, and those of the suffering duly cheered by sympathy—then let all good be said of the *inuring* process; at least all the good that is true; and that is much. No wise man will declare that it is the best and healthiest condition for any one. No wise man will deny that the healthiest moral condition is found where there is the most abundant happiness. Happiness is clearly the native, heavenly atmosphere of the soul—that in which it is 'to live, and move, and have its being' hereafter, and in proportion to its share of which, now and here, it makes its heavenly growth. The divinest souls—the loftiest, most disinterested, and devoted—all unite in one testimony, that they have been best when happiest; that they were then most energetic and spontaneously devoted—least self-conscious. This must and may joyfully be granted. But, as the mystery of evil is all round about us, as we have no choice whether or not to suffer, we may be freely thankful next for the inuring process, as being the possible means, though inferior to happiness, of divine ends."—p. 151.

We should feel ourselves unjust to the spirit of the Author, if we held back his pleading for the prisoners who have no hope, no 'Power of Ideas,' no thoughts of God and his Kingdom within the soul, to sustain them against the sore evils and temptations of sickness when combined with physical misery and destitution. The sick Room from which this pleading goes forth to the heart of Humanity is as a Prophet's chamber; and the brightest hour of life is less privileged than the experience which entitles a spirit to entreat and remonstrate thus, on behalf of fellow-sufferers less blessed and endowed, with all who share the responsibility of causing the inward and the outward man to perish miserably together, 'for lack of knowledge.'

"I have said how unavailing is luxury when the body is distressed and the spirit faint. At such times, and at all times, we cannot but be deeply grieved at the conception of the converse of our own state, at the thought of the multitude of poor suffering under privation, without the support and solace of great ideas. It is sad enough to think of them on a winter's night, aching with cold in every limb, and sunk as low as we in nerve and spirits, from their want of sufficient food. But this thought is supportable in cases where we may fairly hope that the greatest ideas are cheering them as we are cheered: that there is a mere set-off of their cold and hunger against our disease; and that we are alike inspired by spiritual vigour in the belief that our Father is with us,—that we are only encountering the probations of our pilgrimage,—that we have a divine work given us to carry out, now in pain and now in joy. There is comfort in the midst of the sadness and shame when we are thinking of the poor who can reflect and pray,—of the old woman who was once a punctual and eager attendant at Church,—of the wasting child who was formerly a Sunday-scholar,—of the reduced gentleman or destitute student who retain the privilege of their humanity,—of 'looking before and after.' But there is no mitigation of the horror when we think of the savage poor, who form so large a proportion of the hungerers,—when we conceive of them suffering the privation of all good things at once,—suffering under the aching cold, the sinking hunger, the shivering nakedness,—without the respite or solace afforded by one inspiring or beguiling idea.

"I will not dwell on the reflection. A glimpse into this hell ought to suffice, (though we to whom imagery comes unbidden, and cannot be banished at will, have to bear much more than occasional glimpses;) a glimpse ought to suffice to set all to work to procure for every one of these sufferers, bread and warmth, if possible, and as soon as possible; but above everything, and without the loss of an hour, an entrance upon their spiritual birthright. Every man, and every woman, however wise and tender appearing and designing to be, who for an hour helps to keep closed the entrance to the region of ideas,—who stands between sufferers and great thoughts, (which are the angels of consolation sent

by God to all to whom he has given souls,) are, in so far, ministers of hell,—not themselves inflicting torment, but intercepting the influences which would assuage or overpower it. Let the plea be heard of us sufferers who know well the power of ideas,—our plea for the poor,—that, while we are contriving for all to be fed and cherished by food and fire, we may meanwhile kindle the immortal vitality within them, and give them that ethereal solace and sustenance which was meant to be shared by all, 'without money and without price.' "—p. 165.

There is little of direct and naked introduction of Religion into this book,—no vaguely pious offering of that unembodied consoler to the poor sufferer,—but there is not a view nor a sentiment in it, that is not taken from our highest and holiest relations, breathed from God's secret place. It is impossible not to feel that religion is the daily life of the recording sufferer, and that it does not stand apart from any moment of existence, from any estimate of peace or good. Less is said directly of religion, because the mind has no other way of looking upon life than the religious one. Earth, pain, solitude, are raised up to God, not left, that God may be met in abstractions. If the book had been totally wanting in such passages as the following, we should not the less have felt that only one Spirit was the inspirer, sustainer, the daily and nightly nourisher of the nature from which it proceeded.

"This kind of solace could not be,—nor any effectual kind,—but for the power of the master idea of our life. But for Him who 'stirreth up the nest,' and whose spirit 'taketh and beareth them up' sunwards on her wings, the flights of these eagle spirits would utterly fail. But for the ideas inspired by Faith, there could be no enterprise, no true solace, no endurance but of the low, merely submissive kind. Great is the power of all thought, congenial with our nature, over disease of body and morbid tendencies of the mind; but those which connect us with the Maker of our frame, and the ordainer of our lot are absolutely omnipotent. O! let the speculative observer of human nature consider well, and observe that human nature to its extremest limits, before he pronounces that our spirits are not created filial. Let him ponder well the universal aspiration towards a spiritually-discerned parent, before he declares the affection a mere venerable superstition. Let him feel in health and full action,—(or, if he feels it not, let him detect in others,) the pausing horror of a sense of orphanhood, beneath which the moral universe falls in pieces under the hands of its myriad builders. Let him see in the sick chamber, where the outward and inward world seem alike to the sufferer to be crumbling asunder, how irresistible is the conviction of an upholding power, new-modelling all decaying things, and imbuing them with immortality. If he himself can but learn what protracted sickness is, let him ponder well whether a superstition, however early and solemnly conveyed and cherished, could stand the stress,—

not merely of pain, but of the questionings prompted by pain. Let him say if it can be anything but truth,—absolute congeniality with our souls,—which can give such all-conquering power to the idea of our filial relation to the Ruler of all things."—p. 173.

In the closing Essays on the Perils and Privileges of Invalidism, there is a most wise caution to all sick people, not to keep a diary. It is a caution that ought to be extended to all sick minds. To all such, Journals become permanent records of feebleness; foolish fancies; vain, unhealthy,—perhaps ignoble and guilty imaginations; wretched lapses from the dignities and duties of our being;—not only fastening down into fixed forms what otherwise might have passed from the mind, but cherishing the disease and malady of heart, and rendering all escape from that evil, of which we keep such prized and careful monuments, almost impossible. If any is sick at heart and has nursed the sickness,—if they would not fall into the lowest, and meanest depth of spiritual death,—let them cast themselves outwards on such healthy affections as they have, on their duties, and their God,—and, without an hour's delay, destroy for ever, as a link of the fearful chain that would drag them back into their hell, all sensible expression and record of the infirmity and selfishness in which they dishonoured their lives, and abandoned their privilege to struggle upwards to God.

There is a caution, also, against the dangers of intellectual fickleness, and the impetuous publication of crude opinions, which seems artificially introduced by the link of the confidences, respecting all states of mind, of which the sick Room is the Depository. The whole discussion seems not to grow very naturally out of the subject, or train of thought, in the Essay,—but, whencesoever it comes, it leads to the intimation that a new volume, 'On the Formation and Publication of Opinions,' might profitably issue from the retreat of some privileged and gifted Invalid. We should be compelled to enter serious objection to the first of its announcements, namely, the ineffectualness of direct effort with faults and temptations, and the advisableness of a reliance on collateral aids, and a removal to new influences and elements of enterprise. This is a case in which the Invalid has generalised, what may be perfectly true in reference to his own position. We have no great faith in the salvation of circumstance. New scenes, influences, and enterprises may awaken indeed a moral sense hitherto dead, or remove an outward obstacle,—but never will they regenerate a Conscience, feeble and false to itself, weak and fallen, against knowledge and through wilful self-indulgence. New life, here, must come from within. The lines of Wordsworth,—

"'Resolve!' the haughty moralist would say:
'This single act is all that we demand.'
Alas! such wisdom bids a creature fly,
Whose very sorrow is that Time hath shorn
His natural wings!"———

do not contradict this. We admit that he cannot fly at once,—but he can get up from the dust and *stand*, and this he can do only by a quickening of life within,—and in time, if he continues "faithful in a very little," he will walk, and fly, and "mount up with wings, as eagles."

There are several passages in the book, relating to the personal usefulness, services, and, apparently, distinction, of the Author which we could wish had been omitted. They render the topics of the work less universal; the questions arising out of these matters are not of much value in themselves, nor capable of having any general principle applied to them for the guidance of others,—and their introduction is felt as a slight interruption to the otherwise unbroken elevation of the sentiment.

The Author, so far as can be collected from the pictures and incidents given, has described an Invalid peculiarly gifted and prepared for such trial,—with ample intellectual resources, with a Memory stored with various knowledge, with an Imagination as renewing as, nay much more so than, blessed Nature herself to many a robust man,—with a heart full of all gentle feelings and divine trusts,—and linked to a thousand friends,—and a life from which God wafts to his prisoner the fragrance of past beneficence. The common order of Invalids must not be discouraged if they cannot realize, and reproduce in their own experience, 'Life in the Sick Room.' A fellow sufferer has spoken to them, and what is attainable by one is open to the aspirations of all. It will be something great and unspeakable if the views it presents, should reconcile them with their God, and give them just, sustaining and tender convictions of His Providence and Love,—even though they should fail, for a time, to set them at peace with themselves. A happy, clear, trustful view of God takes all bitterness out of the heart and the lot, and endears the sufferings and tears even of a struggling spirit, that has not yet gained the mastery over its weaker self. Nothing divine is impossible so long as the mind is not soured, and we should think it scarcely possible to read this book, and retain the feeling that God, or man, or life was set against us.

To the Author inconceivable must be the alleviation, not voluntarily contemplated, but nevertheless felt through divine love, that in the days of languishing, God has employed him in the noble service, to which in all ages the highest minds have

been devoted, of unfolding and making clear the divine mission of Sorrow. To how many sufferers, lately, have the words of this book been as the words of life,—raising the prostrate and fallen to the sense that there yet remains for them duty, nay glory! If the Author could see the sick beds where they have been treasured, kept nigh beneath the pillow with other sacred things; the wasted hands that have eagerly grasped them,—the faded eyes that have grown lustrous as they read, he would take comfort from the thought that, inasmuch as God requires a true word to be spoken for the sustenance of human hearts, no price can be too costly for the qualifications, that enable that word to be spoken with reality and power.

If to one thus solaced we had the means of sending thanks, of breathing back a sustaining word in return for all we have received, we would employ for the purpose the lines, not faultless but sufficient through their earnestness, which Monckton Milnes, in his late volume, has addressed to one evidently in the circumstances of the Author of 'Life in the Sick Room.'

"Mortal! that standest on a point of time,
With an eternity on either hand,
Thou hast one duty above all sublime,
Where thou art placed serenely there to stand:

"To stand undaunted by the threatening death,
Or harder circumstance of living doom,
Nor less untempted by the odorous breath
Of Hope, that rises even from the tomb.

"For Hope will never dull the present pain,
And Time will never keep thee safe from fall,
Unless thou hast in thee a mind to reign
Over thyself, as God is over all.

"'T is well in deeds of good, though small, to strive,
'T is well some part of ill, though small, to cure,
'T is well with onward, upward, hopes to strive,
Yet better and diviner to endure.

"What but this virtue's solitary power,
Through all the lusts and dreams of Greece and Rome,
Bore the selected spirits of the hour
Safe to a distant, immaterial home?

"What but this lesson, resolutely taught,
Of Resignation, as God's claim and due,
Hallows the sensuous hopes of Eastern thought,
And makes Mohammed's mission almost true?

"But in that patience was the seed of scorn—
Scorn of the world and brotherhood of man;
Not patience such as in the manger born
Up to the cross endured its earthly span.

"*Thou* must endure, yet loving all the while,
Above, yet never separate from, thy kind,—
Meet every frailty with the gentlest smile,
Though to no possible depth of evil blind.
"This is the riddle thou hast life to solve;
But in the task thou shalt not work alone;
For, while the worlds about the sun revolve,
God's heart and mind are ever with his own."

We have introduced the second work, 'Practical Suggestions towards alleviating the Sufferings of the Sick,' into the heading of this Article, not for the purpose of reviewing it, for it is the third Edition, published in 1837, that lies before us, but to draw attention to a book, not very widely known, full of practical wisdom, and that might prove an invaluable help and comfort to friend, nurse, physician, and invalid. It is more comprehensive in its plan than 'Life in the Sick Room,' with which it is often parallel in experience and suggestion, and only less interesting because it is a collection of experiences and testimonies, and not the living fruits of a single mind. It is a Book to lie by the patient and his attendants to be taken up at intervals,—and rarely will it fail to divert the sufferer from himself, or to suggest some new artifice of kindness and wisdom even to the most skilful and tender nurse.

The first part consists chiefly of Suggestions offered to the friends and attendants of the Sick, including nurse, visitor, and physician.

How true is this plea in justification of a new book in the service of the Sick!

"The works hitherto published, are chiefly intended for their spiritual aid, and for short and dangerous attacks of illness, and are seldom applicable to the depression and debility of protracted disorders; *they are written in cold blood by the healthy;* and instead of 'coming home to the business and bosom' of the poor Patient, seem to him as though couched in a foreign language. *They lay the body out of the question,* at the very time when it is becoming to the poor sufferer, alas! almost every thing."—p. 3.

We may mention one or two instances of parallel experience and suggestion with 'Life in the Sick Room.' Thus:—

"Narrative is the least injurious reading for Invalids; and travels, biography, history, or any subjects that carry them away from themselves, the most salutary—having an effect on the mind and spirits similar in kind, though less in degree, to that produced on the body by change of air and scene."—p. 20.

Again:—

"Another requisition, sometimes made from an Invalid, is equally

distressing, because impossible to be complied with; he is often exhorted 'not to let distressing subjects dwell on his mind so much: not to *allow* himself to be so much affected by such and such thoughts;' not to torment himself, or be so anxious, &c.,—and is sometimes blamed for not making efforts to disengage his mind—efforts as wholly impracticable to him, as it would be to heal a wound in the flesh, or set a broken bone, by an act of volition."—p. 47.

With respect to the advisableness of excluding friends in seasons of the greatest suffering:—

"There are times when the utmost kindness of beloved and trusted friends can do or bear so little for him, that the Patient is almost tempted to wish the endeavour were not made; in short, that such friends were not present, in order that there might yet be something left to hope in on earth, some possibility of relief to look for; and that the practical conviction might be warded off, that '*even they* can do nothing for me now.' Alas! the sufferer looks every way, and calls to everything, for relief, till the loud replies from every quarter, 'It is not in me,' prove how vain is the help of man, and should turn the forlorn heart to the only true source of help and consolation, to Him who says, 'In me is thy help,'—'Look unto me,'—'I am the Lord that helpeth thee.'"—p. 59.

With respect to truth and simplicity of communication with the Invalid on the realities of his state:—

"One might be almost tempted to conclude that a decree had gone forth against concealment, so very seldom has it proved *successful*.———

"Where there is the probable prospect of serious, long, or dangerous illness, it is generally best for both parties, certainly for the Invalid, to have it recognised. For the nurse or friend to be always pretending to expect him soon to be well, or to take it for granted the disorder is only a slight one, when it is known to be a serious one, and so refer to the future under that impression, is vexing to the patient, who, in order to avoid dispute, is, perhaps, induced to subscribe to this idea, and to conceal his own knowledge of his state. In what can this plan of mutual dissimulation end, but in depriving the Patient of those advantages which arise from a full recognition of his claims to pity and attention!"—p. 82.

With respect to the necessity of friends and nurses cheerfully reminding the Patient how time passes, so that through ignorance he should not wear out the strength and affection of attendants:—

"Even of fatigue they cannot be expected to form an adequate estimate; they are apt to compare it with pain, and so to underrate it;

it would be unreasonable to *expect* them to be considerate. The attendants and friends should themselves be considerate for the Patient, by taking care of themselves, as we have already suggested, and showing that they do so; telling when they are tired, and going to rest, &c.; and that, not in a tone of apology or expostulation, but as *taking for granted* they are thus doing what the poor Patients would most earnestly wish and require, and what they would have *requested*, had not their own sufferings driven it out of their *recollection*—not out of their disposition. Believe—conclude—that they are most anxious you should not be injured by your attendance, and that nothing is so bitter to them as hearing or perceiving that you are so. They are particularly alive to self-reproach, and perhaps this is of all others the subject on which it is most easily excited, and most bitterly felt."—p. 85.

With regard to the importance of keeping up continually a healing intercourse with God's grace in Nature:—

"When the pressure of pain will allow me to look through the window on the face of nature, methinks I can make more a companion of its various features then when I have been able to walk abroad among them in the full relish of health. The sky, that part of the landscape which in general has not its due proportion of regard, seems full of intelligence; and when the sun 'paints the sky gay as he sinks to his rest,' and

'The living eyes of heaven
Awake, quick kindling o'er the face of ether
One boundless blaze,'

the most sick heart becomes elevated and softened. We are raised to sublime contemplations; we are melted to tender recollections; we seem to escape from this lower scene, and to aspire to a loftier existence; to think higher thoughts, to feel purer feelings, and become conscious to the prospect, and recognize the hope, of some superior mode of being."—p. 142, part ii.

We might carry these parallels much farther: they are interesting as confirmatory experience,—both works being written by Invalids.

There is frequently great force and point in the manner in which sentiments, forcible in themselves, are expressed. For example:—

"Sufferings are the only *relics* of the true Cross, and, when turned to our spiritual good, they almost perform the miracles which blind superstition ascribes to the false ones."—p. 102.

Such healthful reading for the sick have Travels and Voyages appeared to the Authors of this work, that they have added in an Appendix, amongst other important matters of a similar

kind, a valuable list of those which have been found, by experience, the most interesting and effective.

The Second Part consists of suggestions offered to the Invalid himself; passages from Scripture adapted to his wants, in various moods; and miscellaneous Extracts, judiciously selected from a large range of writers who have treated of these subjects. To these are added a collection of Prayers adapted to the various vicissitudes of need and feeling in an Invalid,—and a selection of devotional Poetry, with which the work throughout is interspersed.

With one of these passages, from Milton, we take farewell of a subject on which none but the experienced, or the most true and tender of observers, are qualified to speak; glad to believe that the sick and the suffering depend not on the wisdom of the untried, and the patience of the healthy, but have the Comforter "very nigh unto them, even in their hearts."

> "Many are the sayings of the wise,
> In ancient and in modern books enroll'd,
> Extolling patience as the truest fortitude;
> But with the afflicted in his pangs, their sound
> Little prevails; or rather seems a tune
> Harsh, and of dissonant mood from his complaint;
> Unless he feel within,
> Some source of consolation from above,
> Secret refreshings, that repair his strength,
> And fainting spirits uphold."

ART. IV.—MEMOIR OF THE LIFE OF LORD SYDENHAM: with narrative of his administration in Canada (by his Secretary, Mr. MURDOCH). By his brother, J. POULETT SCROPE, Esq., M.P. London: 1843.

WE do not notice this work on account of its intrinsic merits; for it appears to us about as uninteresting as the biography of an eminent politician could easily have been made. The memoir of Lord Sydenham's life is nothing better than an indiscriminate panegyric, of that sort which imposes upon nobody, and leaves no other impression than that of distrust of its author's good sense. Mr. Murdoch's share of the work is superior in execution, but equally one-sided. It requires no very intimate knowledge of the state and history of the Canadas, to satisfy one that he frequently exalts his hero at the expence of historical truth. It is the vindication of a partizan. Most of its mis-statements have been exposed in an article of the last Westminster Review, and we have therefore no occasion to notice them further.

Recent events in Canada have called in question the prudence of a concession, which was made to the popular party in that colony: we allude to "responsible government." Previous to the Act of Union, the representative assemblies of Upper and Lower Canada had very little effective power. The provincial form of government may be illustrated by a comparison with the British constitution, to which it bears a kind of analogy. The house of representatives corresponds to our House of Commons, and the legislative council to our House of Lords—except that the councillors are not hereditary, but life-members appointed by the crown. The governor of course represents the sovereign. The executive council answers to our cabinet; being appointed by the governor, and holding office during his pleasure.

The constitution previous to the union was not unlike that of England under the Stuarts. The king, in appointing his ministers, bestowed no thought upon the state of parties in the house of commons. The monarch's personal favour was of infinitely greater importance to a ministry, than a parliamentary majority: the latter, indeed, was held to be quite immaterial. A secretary of state would be found lunatic, if he were to throw up his office because a hostile vote had passed the house. Cardinal Wolsey never dreamed of resigning the great seal because the Commons were not subservient to his wishes. Thus, the parliament having no power over the ministry, the popular branch of the constitution became almost nugatory. The par-

liaments might wring from the monarch a consent to the abrogation of some odious branch of his prerogative—such as impressing or quartering soldiers, or imprisoning suspected persons without trial. But no sooner was the parliamentary pressure withdrawn, than the prerogative, like a bent spring, flew back to its old position. The minister who had first committed, or advised the unpopular acts, found no great difficulty in eluding the barriers which had been raised against a repetition of them.

It was thus in Canada. And the governors had the additional advantage of appointing their house of lords—the legislative council. The policy which had been persevered in for half a century, was such as to leave no available political power in the hands of the representatives of the people. The legislative council was filled with men of the anti-popular party; devotedness to the governor, and unpopularity in the other house, being the chief qualifications for membership. The governor thus secured the rejection of any unpalatable bills sent up from the commons, and therefore might treat them and their votes with silent contempt. He was not at the pains of forming a ministerial party in the house; the members of his cabinet seldom had seats there, and he possessed no recognised organ of his wishes or policy. The two houses were left, undisturbed, in a perennial state of hostility, which kept them powerless; while all the functions of supreme sway were exercised by the governor and his cabinet. The revenue of the crown was so settled as to make it, in a great measure, independent of money-votes; so that the stoppage of supplies was no very formidable evil. Thus, while the house of representatives was reduced to a stale-mate, the governor had as perfect a liberty of action as any despotic ruler.

No doubt such a state of things was sure to breed discontent; and the revolt in Upper Canada must be ascribed principally to the disloyal feelings engendered by this irritating hostility. It was necessary to make some change, and the only question is, whether the ministry of the day went about it wisely. The difficulties in which Sir Charles Metcalf has just found himself involved, owing to the concession referred to, are certainly not decisive against it; but they prove that the question is still open for discussion.

Lord Sydenham, acting under the directions of Lord John Russell, introduced into the Canadian government the principle of responsibility, which has prevailed in England since the revolution. By this material change of system, the governor was reduced at once, from a despotic to a constitutional sovereign.

As long as he holds his place, and has not his hands tied by specific directions from the Colonial-office, the governor has precisely the same quantity of power in Canada, as her Majesty has in Great Britain. His cabinet, the executive council, is responsible for his acts. He has the agreeable privilege of being held incapable of doing wrong. But the executive council, like the English cabinet, cannot now, constitutionally, continue in office unless they have a majority in the Canadian house of commons. Thus the house controls the council, and the council controls the governor. For, as the councillors are responsible for his acts, he must only act by their advice. Otherwise, it will be their duty and their interest to resign; and as he cannot supply their places with other men, if the house will not sanction the change, the whole machine is brought to a full stop. And the working of this system was secured against attack on the part of the governor, by resigning the hereditary revenues of the crown, and leaving the whole power of the purse, except only the Civil List, with the house of representatives. The commons move the wheels. The governor's only power is that of changing his council, and trying the experiment of a dissolution of parliament. If the people hold their minds, he must submit, eventually, to become a puppet in the hands of a hostile parliament, and a hostile cabinet.

Now the question is—will this do for a colony? The governor is the only link between the mother-country and the offshoot; and to make him virtually powerless, is to go a great way towards severing the one from the other. If Canada were to be made into an absolute republic, and every question in dispute were to be settled by the votes of native Canadians,—she would of course cease to be a province of the British Empire. In the event of a war between England and America, the Canadians would be free to choose their own side. They might find it safer and more agreeable to take part with their neighbours, and against us: and we could not reasonably blame them for doing so.—The case is but slightly altered, when, instead of a pure republic, we have a government, in form monarchical but, republican in spirit and in fact. And such certainly is the British constitution, which has been bestowed on Canada. Every one sees that the personal inclinations of the soverign are as nothing, against the wishes of the people. If those wishes are only strong enough to hold out against two or three dissolutions, and against the influence and patronage of the crown, the queen of Great Britain, or the governor of Canada, is a cypher. It will avail the governor nothing, to be backed by the Colonial-office, or the British parliament: the ultimate power rests with the

democracy of Canada. Supposing the people to be bent on joining the United States in a declaration of war upon England, the English viceroy may be compelled to set his hand to it—or to reduce the province to anarchy.

There is a parallel case, unhappily, by which this may be illustrated. If Ireland were to have a separate parliament, it would be in the power of the Irish people, whenever they were firmly bent upon it, to wage war against England. The common link, a titular sovereign, would be too feeble to bear the strain upon it. As long as a monarch truly holds a sword, he may hold together two countries with separate popular assemblies: when the sceptre is no more than an ornament, the conflicting interests which drag them asunder, are sure to be too strong for him. It is true there were no overt acts of hostility between the two countries during the old Irish parliament. But the reasons are obvious. The Irish house of commons did not represent the whole people, but a minority; and therefore had very little moral weight. They represented that party which was most closely united with England, by descent, by religion, and by fear of the catholic majority. And most of the members were in the pay of English ministries. Yet, in spite of all this, there was very little cordiality between the two parliaments. They passed hostile tariffs: the Irish members were perpetually declaiming against the tyranny of England: and the only thing in which they united heartily was in persecuting the catholics. It is hardly doubtful, therefore, but an Irish parliament, elected by and from the whole people, without distinction of religion, would not be at peace with England one moment longer than its interest or convenience dictated.

The spirit of the Canadian people, it is true, may not at present be so hostile towards this country, as that of the Irish. But it is no less true, that their immediate interests, and even their geographical position, are likely to lead them away from an English and into an American alliance. And the mere prospect of independence is perhaps flattering enough to their vanity, to seduce them from their allegiance.

But, it may be objected, it is the prerogative of the crown to declare war or conclude peace. In other words, it is the prerogative of the cabinet. If the governor acts in opposition to his council, the members of it must resign: they cannot be responsible for acts of which they disapprove. We apprehend that no artificial limitations, no restrictions set upon responsibility by act of parliament, no wiredrawn distinctions between domestic and imperial questions, can be relied upon as breakwaters against this difficulty. Upon the resignation of the council, if

the people and their representatives will but support them by constitutional means, the governor must be defeated. His only hope will then rest upon another suspension of the constitution, an importation of English bayonets, and in short the conquest of an independent people. Our alternative will lie between this, and an abandonment of Canada.

In fact, even this wretched alternative will not be available. We shall be forced to give up the province without a struggle, as soon as a numerical majority of the Canadians desire it. For, in legal right, the populace is now omnipotent. No act of theirs, however displeasing to us, will justify us in taking away their constitutional rights by military force. The attempt to do so would be suicidal: it would arouse the just indignation of the Canadian people; it would make them our irreconcileable enemies, and throw them into the outstretched arms of the United States. If we commenced a war on such indefensible grounds, —if we were guilty of that greatest of crimes, a war of aggression—aggression, too, against the rights of a free people, made free by ourselves,—no sane person could look for any other result than that of the American war of independence. We must submit, then, to the conclusion, that the Canadians have it in their power to gain their independence, without a war, as soon as they take it into their heads to wish for it. We have given them the legal power to make it impossible for us to govern them. We can only take it away by an act of the grossest injustice, such as, it is to be hoped, the English people never would sanction; and which, if they did sanction it, would only defeat its own object.

Thus far the connection between Canada and Great Britain is loosened. It is a fact worthy of notice, that statesmen who advocate our present colonial system, should themselves have struck it this heavy blow,—the heaviest which it has received since the first American war. They seem to have done it unintentionally: otherwise, the inconsistency would have been remarkable enough. However we are not now concerned with the merits of past or present administrations. The prosperity of Canada is too important a subject to be mixed up with the shifting interests of party politics.

In theory it is no doubt true, that every colony ought to be independent as soon as it is fit for self-guidance. We must not keep Canada in pupilage after it has grown into manhood. And perhaps the only proof we can have, of a colony's fitness for freedom, is, its wish to acquire it. It may thus be thought no more than reason, that the Canadians should have the power, as they now have, of obtaining independence by merely willing it:

and the safety-valve, which saves Canada and England from the explosion of a war, may be looked upon as a wise and merciful contrivance. And no doubt there is much truth in this view.

Yet, on the other hand, there are considerations which make us pause, and modify the approbation with which we might otherwise regard the measure. Perhaps it is an advantage to a colony, in some respects, to be made to feel that a separation from the mother-country is an act fraught with danger and difficulty. It is not good to make such a severance too easy; or a very slight disgust, a momentary caprice, a quarrel which might have been healed by fair concession on both sides, may prove enough to drive them upon the irrevocable step. It is a wise policy that casts obstructions in the way of divorces between man and wife. The best friends may quarrel, and, while the heat lasts, be anxious to part, who, if they are forced to keep together, will soon be reconciled, and as cordial as at first. And it is certain that disputes, such as that at present subsisting between the governor of Canada and the house of representatives, would be soon healed, if the Canadians felt that it was necessary, either to make some little concession, or to prepare, if they pushed matters to an extreme, for a rebellion and war with England. As it is, they have only to hold by their constitutional rights, and take up a defensive attitude, and they will at once be perfectly safe from military violence, and become an independent state.

Thus a whim may separate them from us, and very likely will do so before long. And yet we know of no greater calamity that could befal Canada, than a present independence. She has not yet attained enough of unity to form a nation. A national spirit has not had time to grow up; and, without it, national existence is impossible. The amalgamation between the French and British Canadians must be the work of years to come; and until it is accomplished, or at least far more advanced than it yet is, freedom from English superintendence would only lead to civil war. The weaker party would call in foreign aid, and it is not easy to set limits to the disasters which must ensue. The violence of the hostility of the two races may be seen from the following passages in Lord Durham's Report:—

"I expected to find a contest between a government and a people; I found two nations warring in the bosom of a single state: I found a struggle, not of principles, but of races; and I perceived that it would be idle to attempt any amelioration of laws or institutions, until we could first succeed in terminating the deadly animosity that now separates the inhabitants of Lower Canada into the hostile divisions of French and English. It would be vain for me to expect that any description I can

give will impress upon your Majesty such a view of the animosity of these races as my personal experience in Lower Canada has forced on me. Our happy immunity from any feelings of national hostility, renders it difficult for us to comprehend the intensity of the hatred which the difference of language, of laws, and of manners, creates between those who inhabit the same village, and are citizens of the same state. The national feud forces itself on the very senses, irresistibly and palpably, as the origin or the essence of every dispute which divides the community; we discover that dissensions, which appear to have another origin, are but forms of this constant and all-pervading quarrel; so that every contest is one of French and English in the outset, or becomes so ere it has run its course."—pp. 8, 9.

But, perhaps, the sanguine will hope, this animosity will be confined to words and thoughts, and will not break out into actual war. It is a faint hope; since even the terror of an English army did not prevent the rebellion, which was, in fact, a war between the races, in which the French were worsted.

"The treasonable attempt of the French party to carry its political objects into effect by an appeal to arms, brought these hostile races into general and armed collision.——The French population, removed from all actual share in the government of their country, brood in sullen silence over the memory of their fallen countrymen, of their burnt villages, of their ruined property, of their extinguished ascendancy, and of their humbled nationality. To the government and the English they ascribe these wrongs, and nourish against both an indiscriminating and eternal animosity. Nor have the English inhabitants forgotten in their triumph the terror with which they suddenly saw themselves surrounded by an insurgent majority, and the incidents which alone appeared to save them from the unchecked domination of their antagonists. They find themselves still a minority in the midst of a hostile and organised people; apprehensions of secret conspiracies and sanguinary designs haunt them unceasingly, and their only hope of safety is supposed to rest on systematically terrifying and disabling the French, and in preventing a majority of that race from ever again being predominant in any portion of the legislature of the province."—p. 20.

In short, according to Lord Durham, French and English, in Canada, hate like Orangemen and Repealers. There is, perhaps, some exaggeration in all this eloquence; and both parties have since had five years of tranquillity to cool down in. But no community can be safe, which is divided between two powerful factions, hating each other more bitterly than they hate foreigners. Both will be ready to call in foreign aid: and the country must either become the arena, in which stronger states, auxiliaries on either side, fight out their own battles; or it must be dismembered like Poland; or fall under the yoke of the foreign invaders. Canada would certainly be swallowed up in

the United States, though not, perhaps, till after years of bloodshed. She might share the fate of Texas; or perhaps become the Botany Bay—the Siberia—of the American republic. At all events, the Canadians would not retain that independence, which half a century of consolidation under the protection of England would ensure for them. Her thin and scattered population would be unable to resist a people, which colonizes as fast as it conquers.

It seems highly desirable that Canada should eventually become a separate state, and not be merged in the American Federation. There would be the obvious advantage of having a counterpoise in North America to that formidable republic; a counterpoise, not merely to its political power, but to the immoralities and vices of its system. There would be a place on the transatlantic Continent, where dishonesty was not respectable: and where statesmen were not compelled slavishly to bow to every caprice, and flatter every folly, of the populace. Canada would be the seat of a new form of civilization, instead of falling into the ranks of the United States. Those amiable enthusiasts who attribute all vice and all misery to the overpressure of population, or the defects of monarchical governments, might hope to see another Utopia grow up North of the St. Lawrence. Such men hailed with joy the planting of the American provinces, and the era of American independence; and looked hopefully on the establishment of a great republic, free from the faults of European communities. Their expectations, it is true, have been sadly disappointed. Yet, with all the faults of the Americans, there can be no doubt but the influence which their republic has had upon Europe is immense, and prolific of much good. The entirely different ways of thinking and of acting which the Americans display cannot fail to have given an impetus to the minds and conduct of men in other countries. The establishment of any new form of civilization must produce a wide and beneficial effect upon all the old ones, as it cannot fail of evolving many new ideas, some of which, at least, must be of value. Its very errors contain germs of truth; or, at least, they serve for warnings.

Hence it will be an advantage to all the civilized world if the Canadians, instead of following on the beaten track of the citizens of the United States, strike out a new one for themselves,—as they will do, no doubt, if they preserve their nationality. The Millennarians will then have a fresh impulse given to their benevolent hopefulness; and the less sanguine will expect to derive advantage from the many new experiments in

government and all the arts of life, of which a young nation must be the subject.

For these reasons, we cannot look without some alarm at the danger which now seems to threaten our connection with Canada; and the workings of a measure which has a tendency to loosen our hold upon that country. The former system, indeed, was every way faulty, and calculated to excite discontent. And it is always too late to think of taking back any political concession: the British government would have neither the right nor the power to do so.

Nor would we subject ourselves to Lord Bacon's rebuke:— "That which is past is gone and irrecoverable, and wise men have enough to do with things present and to come; therefore they do but trifle with themselves, that labour in past matters." For a lesson may be inculcated that has reference to the future. It is, that, as we have given the Canadians the *power* to separate themselves from us without much difficulty, we must be the more careful not to give them the *inclination*. We must respect their constitutional and commercial privileges; and must do all we can, by the mildness of our sway, to make them so contented under British protection, that they may not be over-hasty to cast it off.

L.

Art. V.—A SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT ON THE RESULTS OF A SPECIAL INQUIRY INTO THE PRACTICE OF INTERMENT IN TOWNS. By Edwin Chadwick, Esq.

This publication *completes* the Sanitary Report of the Health of Towns' Commission. We congratulate the Commissioners on the discharge of this great portion of their onerous and far-reaching labours: and we congratulate the British public on the possession of a body of evidence on this subject, so widely collected, so carefully sifted, and so ably condensed and arranged. A flood of strong light has been poured on many matters of the most vital concernment to society; and evils, hitherto supinely and hopelessly neglected, have been clearly shown to be susceptible of that best of remedies, Prevention!

We can well imagine, that, viewed in vagueness and at distance, the branch of the subject which this publication includes, might have appeared to the Reporter to promise more materials than, on a nearer approach, it was found capable of supplying. It touches upon solemn and imaginative ground: death, and all that relates to it, cannot lay down all their power—we were going to say, all their poetry—before the most dutiful and resolute intention to grapple with them in their most repulsive forms, to enter into their most revolting accompaniments, to follow dreadful facts into those last dark concealments, where corruption itself becomes phosphorescent with truth. We find no difficulty in conceiving that the subject appeared richer in promise than it proved to be in performance; for the nature of the duties imposed upon the Reporter, obviously precluded him from touching upon any topic of mere embellishment, and confined him to those stern, practical views of it, which the official character of the Report demanded. Life is infinitely more diversiform than death; and if this portion of the Report should be found less interesting than the former, it should not be forgotten, that this is a disadvantage, under which the subject itself must always labour.

It was not to be expected, that, amid the mass of matter collected by the zeal and energy of the Commissioners, there should not be many particulars of which different views might be taken, and inferences as to which opinions might be divided. Such, we think, will be found in that section of the Report, which treats of the consequences of the retention of the remains of the dead among the living. It appears to us that a

portion of the evidence here adduced is intended to prove that infectious disorders are communicable by the bodies of those who have died of them. Without the slightest pretension to medical knowledge, and feeling the full temerity of venturing a personal opinion upon such a subject, we would merely observe upon the facts adduced, that they do not seem to us to exclude a different inference. We may farther venture to state our own strong impression, that infectious fevers are not communicable by the bodies of those who have died of them, after the last warmth has left them. That in numbers of cases, the survivors have sickened and died of the same distemper, we cannot for a moment call in question; it is an every-day occurrence;—but it may still be asked, and still be doubted, if the seeds of the disorder were taken from *the body*. Our own impression is, that they were sown at an earlier period, when the exhalations of the living body carried with them the principle of the disease. It appears to us that even popular language will give us strong help in this matter. We should say, that such and such a person had died of fever: but we should not, we think, be justified in saying that such and such a person's *body had* the fever. But if it had it not, how could it communicate it? We have no doubt that the deaths occurring in rooms where the dead are kept long among the living, are very numerous; but may not this be accounted for, from the living themselves being thus crowded together, more naturally than from the occasional retention of the bodies of those who die among them? A person dies of fever in one of these crowded lodging-houses. What *produced* the fever? There might have been no death for a long time before. Is not the vitiation of the air from the respiration of a number of people in a close small space, together with the whole system of life in those forlorn abodes, sufficient to account for the generation of disease, without any aid from the casual presence of the dead? And, when once produced, is not its transmission as easily to be accounted for, without supposing that *the corpse* has any power of transferring it? We confess, that this is the view, which we have long taken of the subject, though it is with the utmost deference that we thus venture to state it. Diseases may destroy life; but in destroying life, they appear to us to destroy *themselves*. Death is often produced by infectious disorders; but we cannot think, that infectious disorders can be propagated by the dead.

The subject adverted to, is one which deserves the utmost attention that it can receive: our only wish is to see it placed upon its proper ground. Is not this the vitiation of the air by

the crowding together of numbers in close and unventilated apartments? And, remedying this, if it be susceptible of remedy, shall we not do more to stop the progress of any contagion, than we could by the most prompt separation of the dead from the living?

The Reporter's object also calls upon him to notice the *opposite* mispractice, that of interring the dead too quickly for decency or humanity. This also needs the deepest attention. The *possibility*, against which we have here to guard, is one of the most awful and appalling that the imagination can frame, and which we cannot bring before our thoughts without a shudder of insuppressible horror. Surely too much is left to the discretion of ignorance in this matter. We have recently come to the knowledge of a case, in which a poor man died at half-past twelve on the Saturday morning, and was buried on the Sunday. To make the circumstance more striking, he had died of no infectious disease, but of a chronic one—an asthma, which had been upon him for years. He had taken medicine to procure sleep, and had slept away. Such a case seemed particularly to call for the retention of the body; but, to avoid the loss of work on the part of the friends and relations, the funeral was performed decently, but too hastily, on the next day. We are perfectly satisfied that, in this instance, there was nothing to need precipitation, yet surely there should have been something in the law of the land to prevent it.

The Report, of course, adverts to the funeral expenses of the labouring classes. Valuable as the evidence here collected is, we think it is capable of being made even more so. The funerals of these classes have long been "a great evil under the sun." Not unfrequently a death will occasion embarrassments, that will extend over years. And this is not necessity, but vanity. We love and honour all true reverence for the dead; but this is not to be shown by contracting debts of ostentation. It is not to be measured by the pomp of the obsequies, but by the attraction of the grave. The showiness of the funeral is often a poor make-up for the hollowness of the grief. The ruinous involvements, which these events commonly occasion have led to the formation of Burial Societies in many large towns; but, for ourselves, we confess we do not look upon their influences as salutary. We do not like a see a poor man's wife doling out her weekly pence for the specific interment of every member of her family. In most of these cases, there are many nearer and nobler wants than coffins. We fear, too, that not unfrequently, the prospect creates the *wish*—a wish which we will not define, but to plant which in the heart the laws of our nature must be

inverted. We have more than once had to close our eyes, by a firm effort, upon living and speaking evidences, that the events, thus prudentially anticipated, were collecting about them associations less and less to be desired. And as to the *management* of these Societies, nothing, in the whole mass of our social errors of omission, requires a more instant, or a more thorough investigation, than the various Associations in which the money of the poor is invested, ostensibly for their own benefit, but, alas too commonly, only for the benefit of those, to whose sordid and rapacious cunning simplicity is a strong temptation, and industry a lucrative prey.

The wish has long been warm at our hearts, that something could be done worthy of a great people, to ease the pressure of death upon the families of the poor. Cemeteries, in which decency and solemnity should be kept always in view, and from which beauty and elegance should not be excluded, might, we cannot help thinking, be open to the labouring classes, if not gratuitously (which is not, perhaps, to be desired) yet, upon terms which would give all a common interest in them. We have witnessed repeatedly the distress and difficulty of a poor family, in raising the money for a grave, when the workhouse had given a coffin. Could these charges be greatly lightened, it would work as a blessing among the people. They have a dislike to parish-burials, which we cannot wish to extinguish. But necessity often compels them to that, to which nothing can reconcile them. Lightened charges for interment in less obnoxious ground would have, we believe, a very salutary effect upon these classes. Amid all its heavy debts to the Poor Man's Home, Society owes a trifle to the Poor Man's Grave.

We meant to have made a few farther remarks upon other parts of this interesting Report; but for the present we must have done. The Work needs no recommendation. No notice of it can come, where it has not long ago penetrated. Long ere this, it has been, we trust, on every man's table who has a heart to grieve over evil, or a hand to help in good.

J. J.

ART. VI.—WHAT'S TO BE DONE? or, PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE. London: Ridgway.

THIS pamphlet contains an able party exposure of what the Whigs did, and of what the Tories ought to have done; of the liberal plans which the one party have proposed and in some instances carried, and which the other party have uniformly and strenuously opposed. It is a party pamphlet, and an able one. Many statements which it contains are honourable to the Whigs and discreditable to their opponents; but it must also be stated that some grievous errors of the Whigs are not mentioned, and that some of their acts are carefully concealed. In the main, however, we have here another illustration of the marked difference between Whig and Tory as it appears in the policy of each of those parties; and the *brochure* may be read with interest and instruction, particularly when toryism, with a majority of one hundred in the House of Commons is about, if we mistake not, to try conclusions once more with the strong common sense, and somewhat latent patriotism of the English people. Let us then examine the nature of the parties whose merits are discussed by our Author. It will appear that Tories and Whigs, though modified by institutions and time, represent the antagonist principles of aristocracy and democracy. An attempt is made to define the objects of the two great parties in the State, the Whig and the Tory—and though it is undoubtedly true that any one seeking from the statements of the partizans, on either side, for the truth, would be met by both with an assurance of the truth of its principles, the justice of its views, and the salutary nature of its general policy, yet we believe the writer, in the main, correctly states the difference between the Whigs and the Tories, modified by the monarchy under which we live, to be that between progress and rest—between the desire to advance mankind, and the determination to keep them at least stationary.—We confess that if to hope for, and to strive to enlighten and improve men, and to contemplate as neither destructive, nor even formidable, any measures calculated, however remotely, to effect an arrival at the limits of human perfection, be to entertain dangerous or revolutionary views, we plead guilty to both. We hold that the existence of an Aristocracy involves original aggression, and its continuance, on a selfish plan, continues its original hostility to the people. Throughout its whole existence, the influence of the aristocracy, as a body, has been exerted in all countries to check the advance

of each new truth, to suppress as dangerous the discoveries of science, to brand as atheistical the unerring calculations of philosophy; equally odious whether, supported by the strong arm of secular power and the divinity of the laws, it sported with the common rights of men,—or leagued with the terrors of superstition to inculcate the doctrines of passive obedience, it used laws and religion, corruption and wealth, to promote its aggrandizement and to consolidate its power,—concentrating against unorganized and unprotected masses unity of purpose, superior education, and a watchfulness for its interests which neither sleeps nor tires. To preserve the reign of "right divine of Kings to govern wrong" it has glozed over the remorseless cruelty, tyranny, and bigotry of many of our Kings. It has sanctified, by an admission into the Church, a service for him who, thinking to tread on a worm, placed his heel upon a serpent. It has, through the whole course of its career, opposed the education of the people; all its movements are retrograde; it is indebted for its power primarily to the force of arms, and, however controlled by the spirit of the times, it has not changed its nature, and now governs by means of corruption, and its consequence, unequal and selfish laws. The history of the Whig principle is the history of the modifications forced upon aristocratic ascendency. To a certain extent the democratic is the Whig principle. It will be seen that we have cause to complain that the Whigs have not carried this principle out, with sufficient force. Arrayed against the aristocratic influence, the democratic spirit has nothing to recommend it but its just and holy purposes, and the principles of that high, Christian philosophy which, however they may have been disguised or perverted, breathe the mild and glorious spirit of the purest democracy. This principle proposes to itself the utmost attainable equalization and happiness of mankind; it has therefore nothing to fear, but everything to hope, from education; it regards as the end of our existence the perfection of order, and the establishment of the only real distinctions amongst men, those of moral character, intellect, and learning. Democracy in England is indebted for most of its victories not so much to the people, in the common acceptation of that term, as to that middle class, enlightened by education, and enriched by trade, which produces thinking men. Among such have often been found those who have supported and advanced the democratic principle through a love of justice and mankind; regarding men not merely as a mass to be governed but as brothers to be enlightened and humanized,—and who know that if the people are sometimes criminal and ungrateful, it is because they have been debased by poverty and

ignorance,—and who also know, how soon the mind loses its divine attributes in the squalidness and misery amid which many of our countrymen are doomed to live. Our author himself describes the leading tendencies of the parties somewhat after our fashion, though probably he would not be content to go with us in all our definitions. He then proceeds to state truly that,—

"The old Whig party wore itself out during the reign of the two first Georges. Having bravely resisted the Stuarts, it corrupted itself by long possession of power; and, doing nothing for the advancement of the people, it fell by dereliction of its own first principles. Governing as Tories, it was necessarily and justly displaced by Tories."

Well would it have been for the Whigs if their attempts to govern as Tories had terminated with their first overthrow. We should not then have heard of *finality*, nor had to lament the fatal error committed, when the Coercion Bill came as the first proof of Whig rule in a country already driven almost to madness and despair by long courses of injustice and oppression. Our author does not allude to this disastrous measure, nor to the timid policy of the Whigs when the nation, as the result of the Reform Bill, had given them a majority until that period never possessed by any government. If in the first session of the reformed parliament, "faithful to their fires," they had carefully and honestly, but above all fearlessly, set about redressing the wrongs of Ireland, instead of passing a law so cruel and so foreign to all their professions as the coercion bill; and had also in the same spirit declared war against class legislation, and hoisted the banner of Free Trade, Sir Robert Peel would in all probability have been indulging his taste for the fine arts in the formation of a new picture Gallery, and the iron duke might have helped Colonel Gurwood to edit other volumes of his life and despatches. The Whigs governing as Tories lost power—public opinion was revolted—the liberals saw an attempt to govern Ireland by force, not by equal justice,—and from that day the prestige attached to the Whigs as a party diminished, and a line, the traces of which are yet strongly marked, was drawn between the representatives of Fox and the Charles Grey of 1794, and the great mass of modern reformers. Our author rapidly sketches the history of party, until the breaking up of the duke of Wellington's government in 1829; and he concludes his summary with the following observations, in the truth of which we heartily coincide:—

"Thus ended the Duke of Wellington's and Sir Robert Peel's first experiment of an expediency government. It came in with a high cha-

racter and professed principles, it went out without either the one or the other. Its first principle was to resist Roman Catholic and Protestant Dissent, and it was conquered by both; its next object was to counteract Parliamentary Reform, and it rendered it only the more certain and more extensive.

"Do we attribute fraud or want of energy to a Government, which so signally broke faith? On the contrary, we think it showed both sense and courage in giving way. But it was guilty of an ignorance of public opinion, and, blinded by its own party repressive principles, it could not comprehend the justice of the claims and rights it opposed. It, therefore, mischievously thwarted and destroyed Mr. Canning's and the Whigs' liberal policy, in order to supersede it by a repressive government against that which manifestly was, and which so soon proved itself to be, too strong for curbing."

The writer then enters on the history of the accession of the Whigs to power, when Lord Grey made his memorable declaration that peace, retrenchment, and reform were the watchwords of Government; alludes to the passing of the Reform Bill, acknowledges that the Whigs carried all before them at the elections, and that when the Reform Bill became the law, "then came their trial." He thus accounts for the sudden change which came over the public mind:—

"They had to work their new machine and to bring up all the institutions of the country to a level with its extended representative powers. There were some few who did not see the necessity for such adjustment; others who seeing it yet alarmed by the recent struggles for the Reform Bill, were content to advance only a few of our institutions, and to advance those few far less than was necessary. Others, again, were for pushing on too far. Unity of purpose was lost, and in its stead came dissension. Public acclamation fell off, and within two years after the passing of the Reform Bill, the Whigs were losing their popularity."

We believe the true reason to have been what we have already stated. And we think the author would have done his party and the country good service by a more accurate examination of the circumstances which produced this revulsion of feeling. After noticing the return of the Tories to power, their signal failure, and the return of Lord Melbourne to office with thinned ranks, he states, and truly states, the triumphs of the Whigs, and says that "the Whig party carried in less than eleven years' possession of office—measures for the advancement and security of RELIGION, EDUCATION, HUMANITY, and LIBERTY, greater than have been carried during the whole period that has elapsed between the revolution of 1688 and their accession in 1830."

These various measures are then discussed at some length; they comprehend the abolition of pluralities, the partial reform of the Irish church in the reduction of the number of bishops, the Irish Education Bill, the attempt at a plan for national education in England, the abolition of slavery, the reformation of what the writer honestly calls "the sanguinary abominations of our penal code," the various measures of retrenchment, the reform of municipal corporations, the passing of the penny postage, a firm but peaceable foreign policy, and various other important measures. To carry, even modified as many of these measures were by an opposing House of Lords, so many useful reforms, entitles the Whigs to high praise. The nation, whilst it laments that more was not attempted, and that much was omitted, yet will not be niggardly in awarding approbation. We owe the Whigs much, and we are ready to pay it, the more so because we think in "the mysterious progression of things," events are teaching them, that true reforms are not to be carried out against powerful, selfish, and unscrupulous adversaries, without determination and vigour; the expression of which, in the recent debates on Ireland, more particularly in the manly speech of Lord Howick, fills us with hope that the day is not far distant, when the Whigs will have another, probably a last opportunity, of peaceably settling the complicated wrongs still endured by the country. Notwithstanding all these acts the Whig Government lost ground.—The writer says that "two powerful and privileged bodies opposed it, the Clergy and the Lords," the one misrepresenting its policy as hostile to the religion and institutions of the country; and the other with its uncontrolled majority defeating or delaying almost every measure which the ministers sent up from the Commons. This is no doubt true, but if the Whigs had, early in their career, properly estimated the counteracting forces arrayed against them, and had insisted on passing the reform bill without the Chandos clause, without the great augmentation of the county representatives, and without preserving the corrupt old freemen in the parliamentary Boroughs, and above all had they done early as to trade in England, and conciliation in Ireland, that which they did late, the Lords and the Clergy would not have dared to obstruct and impede the progress of a great nation on her peaceful march; or if they had, Lord Grey, or Lord Brougham, might have drawn from his pocket the promise of the maker of Peers to augment the number of the House of Lords, and so have prevented the possibility of any immediate danger of collision, whilst the nation secured the establishment of these great and necessary reforms.

The Lords and the Clergy are wise in their generation, they know well how to distinguish between the voice of a nation and that of a party. The Tory benches were empty when the Reform Bill (albeit sorely mutilated) was wrung from the reluctant hands of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal in parliament assembled; but when the more zealous reformers, repelled by the measures to which we have alluded, became distrustful of the Whigs, and myriads of our countrymen left their ancient leaders to augment the Chartist ranks, arrayed under the banners of such men as Feargus O'Connor, then those same Lordly Benches became crowded once more to excess, whenever Whig measures or those having a liberal tendency were to be obstructed or defeated. The Lords became potent when the Whigs lost the people. They scorned all the attempts made to bring them to aid, however slowly, in the work of progression, and we doubt whether any assembly ever displayed more bitterness in its hostility, than that which influenced the Lords during their opposition to the Whigs from the period we have mentioned. This ought to be a lesson to us. The Whigs will do well to erase the word "finality" from their political vocabulary, and gather strength and wisdom from "the sweet uses of adversity."

The next division of the pamphlet is devoted to the principles and proceedings of the Tory, or repressive Government. Our Author says that the ministry had been constructed by all the experienced state-craft of Sir Robert Peel, strengthened by the Duke of Wellington, Lord Stanley and Sir James Graham, and that "nearly the whole country weary of the checkmated efforts of the Whigs, and deluded by incessant misrepresentations, looked to this powerful and promising ministry to extricate it from all dangers, real or imaginary." Our author here falls into one of the usual mistakes of a party writer. What he says is true, if by the country he means that part of it not friendly to the policy of the Whigs—it is untrue as to the great body of the country. The people, weary with the want of progress, had become indifferent to the predominance of party. Whether Whig or Tory, they found not only no stand made for liberal principles, but often they were doomed to hear that they had gone too fast, if not too far,—and though they were anxious to proceed firmly to carry out the measures, which they trusted the reform bill would enable them peacefully to obtain, they were checked in their course by those on whom they mainly relied to keep them in progress. Thus weary and hopeless they lost all energy to embark in a mere party struggle, and this indifference of the people arose

from the neglect of the Whigs to take advantage of their position. The Whigs seem to have regarded the reform bill as an end; the people valued it only as a means. At the eleventh hour Free Trade became a watch word with the Whigs,—it was too late; the Tories, strong in the popular indifference, had secured the registration courts, and the Whigs were overthrown.

The writer then gives an account of Sir Robert Peel; acknowledges his domestic virtues, admits his talents in debate, his application to business, and his general abilities as a Statesman; calls him, however, only a second-rate man, and says he has originated nothing but the London Police, and that all about him is common-place, second-hand, well got up. Then follows a sketch of the career of Sir Robert Peel, beginning with his opposition to Mr. Horner's resolutions on the Currency,—showing that in almost every great measure which has been discussed during the parliamentary life of Sir Robert Peel, he has strongly opposed that which he has afterwards adopted,—and contending that this has led to a general distrust of Sir Robert's politics.

There is much truth in this estimate of Sir Robert Peel. He lacks all the qualities which make a *great Statesman*, save one, and that one is of great value—we mean discretion. He is a skilful debater; but even in debate he does not succeed as the ally of any great principle, as the unflinching advocate of measures broad and general in their character and their humanity; his is the triumph of dexterity rather than of truth, and he carries with him no conviction that he himself is sincere in his advocacy. He is, in fact, both in his political position and in his measures, a compromise. Sir Robert Peel, in his manners and disposition, is cold and formal: neither in public nor in private has he feelings which make a man fervent friends. He is as much inferior to Canning, as Canning was to Fox. He has none of the warmth of Canning, none of his polished elegance of manner, none of his powers of eloquence, not a particle of his wit. Sir Robert Peel is not, indeed, an originator; he is merely a dexterous fashioner of other men's goods. Throughout his life the raw material of his measures has been furnished by other men. He is what his father was, a manufacturer. He was educated, as a recruit, to support the aristocracy to which he did not belong; and we do not believe, in the whole course of his career, he has ever, even for a moment, evinced any high faith in mankind—any sympathy for the people. Without these, no man in modern times can be a *great* Statesman. This coldness and want of faith, we fear, be-

longs to a class, as well as to Sir Robert Peel. Public men, of all parties, are in danger in public life of acquiring false notions of the people. A want of faith in humanity is the great vice of almost all public men, and the sooner they begin to think that men are to be governed by reason and justice, and not by force or deception, the better will it be for all classes of our countrymen, as well as for their rulers.

Our Author proceeds to examine in detail various measures of the Tories since their accession to power; displays much tact and knowledge, and, in his general conclusions, we think him right and just. For these we must refer our readers to the work itself: our space does not admit of entering further into these details, more particularly as the concluding portion of the pamphlet is devoted to Ireland; and as their Irish policy involves the fate of the Tory administration as well as that of any administration which may succeed it, our readers may be anxious to learn "What is to be Done," on this by far the most serious question which any European Government has in hand.

"We take the reported evidence of fourteen Irish agents, largely connected with the sale and management of land throughout Ireland, who declared that since 1835, great improvements and investments had taken place in Irish property, and that it had risen *five years purchase* in value. But what is its condition now? Who will buy land? Who will lend money on mortgage? Who will invest capital in improvements there now? Hear a description of it.

"'A dreadful commotion distracts the public mind in Ireland—a feverish agitation, and unnatural excitement prevail to a degree scarcely credible throughout the entire country—social intercourse is poisoned there in its very springs—family is divided against family, and man against his neighbour. In a word, the bands of social life are almost dissevered—the fountains of public justice are corrupted—the spirit of discord walks openly abroad, and an army of physical force is marshalled in defiance of all law to the imminent danger of the public peace.'

"Is this a faithful description? If it is, it is prophetic, for it is Sir Robert Peel's own picture of the state of Ireland, under his own government, not in 1843, but in 1828. Let him compare that picture with the tranquillized state of Ireland under Lord Normanby, or Lord Fortescue, and blush for the calumnies he sanctioned in Parliament against their governments. Let him compare the thriving and friendly state of Ireland in 1841, with that to which he has again reduced it in 1843, and then ask himself, where are the fruits of his conservatism, his boasted statesmanship, and good government."—p. 70.

After noticing the Chartists, the Anti-Corn-Law League, and

the schism of the Scotch Church, the author of the pamphlet introduces this most important subject:—

"But if the reaction Ministry, in two years' government, has been illustrated by schism in Scotland and two insurrections in England, what shall be said of its success IN IRELAND. Sir Robert Peel was for once no false prophet, when he declared in 1839, speaking of his accession to office, 'Ireland will be my difficulty.' And he was more candid than usual, when, on May last, he confessed, '*Ireland was tranquil two years ago* (under the Whigs) *and is now most disturbed.*' This was a painful confession, and a strong but tardy testimony to the good fruits of that government of his predecessors, which he had so perseveringly thwarted and denounced. But the fact was undeniable; and denial no longer useful."

The contrast between Ireland as she was and as she is, is extended over several pages, and many of the grievances under which the Irish labour are stated with boldness as well as accuracy. It is admitted that but for O'Connell much mischief would have ensued in Ireland. Speaking of the army,—

"How," he asks, "would this mighty military force, backed by all the courts of law, and searching acts of parliament, be able to collect Saxon taxes and anti-repealer's rent from hundreds of thousands, or a million or two of defaulters, should affairs be driven on by reciprocal pride and resistance to such a pass as passive non-payment? And how long would small anti-repeal resident landlords be able to withstand such a repeal argument? And how would the English Exchequer like re-imbursing the loyal resisters from year to year?

"We all remember the million advanced to the Irish clergy in lieu of their uncollectable tithes, and how the tithe war under combined civil and military powers miserably failed. Or now, how would this army in Ireland act efficiently if it were for months harrassed in detail, worn out by perpetual marchings and countermarchings, in remote and difficult districts; called out to put down paltry riots and breaches of the peace, sometimes real, and far more frequently fictitious, reported for the express purpose of throwing ridicule on the soldiers, and creating dissatisfaction amongst them? Even on a small scale Rebecca and her daughters for months foiled both a military and a civil force. And again, how long would our soldiers and officers like waging a war upon the cabin: passing through the whole calamitous circle of distraints, seizures, hangings, burnings, famine, pestilence? And how long would this country bear it?"

He goes on to animadvert on the folly of attributing the agitation to O'Connell, and says most truly, echoing the opinion upon resistance to established authority, of that admirable writer and miserable politician Dr. Johnson, that,

"Masses do not rise at the call of one man. It requires years and

breadth of suffering before its murmurs find a voice, and that voice an echo. Mr. O'Connell is but this echo. In himself, able and eloquent and experienced though he be, he is as nothing, it is in the masses of Ireland that the heart of the disease lies, and there it must be softened and cured. However much it may startle some, we think those who have most considered national discontents in a free country, and who wish to see freedom preserved, will rejoice that there is a Mr. O'Connell, a man of substance and vigour, with far-spread relations and having much to lose by disorder, who can for a time stand between us and an angry people."

As might be expected, the recent policy of the Government, as to the Repeal meetings, the proclamation against that at Clontarf, the folly of interference at the eleventh hour, and all the attendant circumstances, are the subject of much judicious criticism; and the folly of the measures is well exposed. The pamphlet was published before the trials terminated, but the truth of one of the writer's predictions is no doubt now felt by the victorious Government, that "a conviction would probably be more disastrous than an acquittal." We shall not trust ourselves at length with any commentary on the Irish trials. History will place them where they ought to be, with the trials on the Rye House plot, among the most disgraceful of our judicial records. Conceived in a paltry and malicious spirit, they were conducted in a manner worthy of their conception. Constructive, cumulative conspiracy was the charge:—the Attorney-General of Ireland, the representative of the majesty of the laws, behaved during the whole of these terrible proceedings in a manner which it is unnecessary to characterise here. Whether when he showed the littleness of spirit which shocked the English Bar, by demanding his license from one of the Counsel of the traversers, or whether when he strove to make evidence against the traversers a conversation on a bridge, between two unknown persons, at night, after one of the monster meetings had quietly dispersed, or whether when he indecently called out Mr. Fitzgibbon, he most degraded his high profession, we leave that profession to determine. The Judge's charge was worthy the Attorney-General's conduct, and befitted the prosecution. The Government, however, deserve all the odium which attaches to this proceeding. They ought to have stopped the trial when the Jury list, whether by design or accident, was found to be mutilated. Sir F. Pollock, it is on all hands admitted, would not have tried a smuggler under such circumstances. We gladly leave this subject; it may not be thought of without shame and indignation; yet even here, in our quiet closet, remote from the stirring scenes of political

action, we cannot dismiss it without expressing exultation that the House of Commons, the people of London, and thousands of our countrymen elsewhere, have received the representative of Ireland with acclamations which rent the skies. With heart-cheering shouts have honest Englishmen, everywhere, hailed O'Connell,—simply because power had strained its bad privileges against him. Forgetting and forgiving all he had said, in a bad and mistaken spirit, as to Saxon and Celt, they have seen the attempt to crush this patriotic man by judicial forms, and the love of Justice abiding in all English hearts has spoken in a voice which has filled the country with its reverberations. When the Bishops were acquitted, James the second heard the cheers of the soldiers in his camp at Hounslow, and asked of Feversham the cause, who told him it was nothing but the soldiers rejoicing for the acquittal of the Bishops. "Call you that nothing?" said he. This was in the month of June; in November he had ceased to reign.

The writer remarks that the Education Bill deserves some comments, and that there has long been a party jealous of the education of the people, seeing clearly enough that it leads almost necessarily to their participation in power. The party referred to has not parted with many of its attributes since the days when it decreed that men should believe without enquiring why, and that "the liberty the people enjoyed in reading the Bible was not a right to which they possessed any claim, but a favour granted of the Royal liberality and goodness." From the determined opposition it has shown to any national system of Education, unmixed with the question of a particular creed, two conclusions may be drawn,—that its interests are inseparably connected with, and depend upon ignorance,—and that it will not consent to educate men, unless they are willing, as the price, to abandon liberty of thought, and place blind reliance on the doctrines of the Church. What is this but an attempt to strike a bargain? The Church says, you shall not have my education, unless you take also my religious opinions. Since men have discovered that there is nothing immoral nor dreadful in education, this party has ceased to oppose it as unholy, but, in the same spirit, effectually checks its progress, by bringing a storm of bigotry to bear against a question which proposes to leave religious instruction to the parent, and contemplates the possibility of no beneficial results from connecting the Bible in the minds of children, with dog-eared leaves, rods and tears. It is well to prepare the ground before sowing the seed, and to impart to the young that knowledge which may enable them to adore the *Being* rather than the *word*. The Church has been actuated, in pursuing this course, by that fatal and unholy zeal

which in darker ages brought men to the scaffold and the stake, and disgraced Christianity by shedding more blood in its name, whose every precept is adverse to violence, than has marked the track of many conquerors. Over that suffering portion of humanity which the bad have combined to injure, and the strong to oppress, the author of Christianity stretched forth his hands, was "moved with compassion" at their sufferings, dwelt beneath their roofs, healed them, fed them, *taught* them. Can the best Christian amongst those who withhold education from the people, no matter on what grounds, reconcile his policy with the example set by Christ? Can he lay his hand upon his heart and say, "Whilst disputing about the interpretation of his words, I have not forgotten what he *did*, I have not made his religion a means for keeping in darkness the minds of men, of polluting their best feelings at the fountain head by infusing the poison of intolerance into youth." We wish they and all men would follow more closely the "friend of Publicans and Sinners;" would mingle freely with the industrious classes; would frequent the bye-ways of great cities, where want and bad air kill more than the plague; would make some show of a desire to discharge their mission here, by educating all the ignorant, by cheering on, in their struggle through life, those who, when thews and sinews fail, have no resource but charity or death, soothing where they cannot succour the hopeless misery of the poor. To them, and to all else, we address the advice of Hooker: "Think ye are men, deem it not impossible for you to err, sift impartially your own hearts, whether it be the force of reason or the vehemency of affection which hath bred, and still doth feed these opinions in you. If truth do anywhere manifest itself, seek not to hide it with glozing delusion, acknowledge the greatness thereof, and think it your best victory when the same doth prevail over you."

At the head of Irish Evils the writer places what he calls "the question of questions, the Church and the Priests," and he proceeds to its discussion with an exhortation to be "just and fear not." "But to do this effectually requires the calming down of many angry feelings, the humbling of pride, the setting aside deep-rooted prejudices or predilections, and the resigning the direction of spiritual affairs to higher authority than man's, or man's short-sighted policy."

He proposes to pay the Catholic priests, to give them glebe lands and houses, to re-organize Maynooth, and enlarge "the grant for the education of the priesthood,—and other minor points, questions of detail into which it would be premature to enter." In favour of this measure, besides its tranquilizing

policy, he cites European authorities: "Catholic France pays Protestant ministers, so does Catholic Austria; Protestant Prussia pays Catholic ministers; a Catholic king rules over a Protestant people in Saxony, whilst a Protestant king in Belgium rules a Catholic kingdom; throughout Germany and Switzerland Protestant and Catholic, Catholic and Protestant live together, in Christian harmony, with mutual respect for each other's creeds, offices, and endowments." Our author next refers to the Irish tenancy, a subject which he passes over, believing that there is a general disposition to meet it fairly and dispassionately. We wish we could agree with him; we entertain no such opinion. Though we have not space here to go at length into this question, the pressing importance of which, those who do not know Ireland, may learn by devoting an hour to the perusal of a fearful pamphlet, called "A Cry from Ireland," which, we gather from Sir Robert Peel's speech, has been perused by the prime minister. Some faint estimate may thence be formed of the horrors of that system, upon which our author thinks the Tories are about to legislate in a fair and humane spirit. The state of the Irish franchise is next discussed, or rather stated, for there is but little said about it, though it is a point of great importance, and one too on which Lord Stanley and his Tory associates deserve severe censure. When the Whig government was supposed to be drawing to an end, every one remembers how Lord Stanley's Irish Registration Bill was pressed on the House of Commons with the malign activity of a renegade and a destroyer, rather than in the spirit of a lover of truth and a legislator. That same bill, which every one who believed Lord Stanley thought too important to be postponed for a single week, Lord Stanley being in power, has not even been mentioned by him, and at the command of Sir Robert Peel, we presume, has been indefinitely postponed, at least as far as Lord Stanley is concerned. The quality for which we gave Sir Robert Peel credit—discretion—will prevent his ever permitting Lord Stanley to put a hand to any Irish affair, much less to the registration question; and thus the irritable Lord who would not "serve in heaven," finds he cannot "reign" over that lower region into which he has made a voluntary descent.

What is said about Ireland is in a good and kind spirit. We should expect the laws, if directed by the writer, to be well administered, and that Ireland would feel as she did when Morpeth and Drummond were Secretaries, and the Irish Squires were reminded "that property had its duties as well as its rights." This is not what is wanted, however good in itself it may be.

The Irish cannot obtain indemnity for the past, but they have a right to demand security for the future. Sympathy and kindness are properly evinced for suffering, but they of themselves heal no wounds. What Ireland wants is Justice. She wants the same franchise; the same share in the representation as England; the same municipal institutions; the same laws: in short, to live under English law as freely and as fully as if no sea rolled between us. She wants, moreover, to be freed from the most galling and degrading burden ever fixed on any nation—that is to say, a Church Establishment which is no Church for the Irish people. This she wants, and must have, and Whigs and Tories will do well to look at all this with the singleness of view which has characterized Lord Howick; for assuredly Ireland will have all this, or she will have her parliament in College Green. We are not Repealers, but we say with Lord Howick "I, for one, would not submit to it." Though we are not Repealers, we are for justice. Let us do the things which are clearly right to be done; then the Repeal cry will be heard no more, and O'Connell himself will acknowledge that he has been conquered by the invincible principles of Justice and truth. We are aware that many thousands of our countrymen are not prepared for this. That they will cry out against any such measures as fatal to the Protestant cause, and dangerous to liberty itself. We reply that nothing can be so dangerous to the Protestant cause as to make it the ally of oppression, and that liberty is safe in the hearts and hands of the English people against far more formidable enemies than the Church of Rome. Besides we must never forget that those who laid the broad and deep foundations of the liberties of England were themselves living in communion with Rome, and were, as Catholics, as sincere and as honest as any Protestant that ever lived. We are of opinion, too, that, supposing these just measures could be much longer refused with impunity, we have no right to refuse them. But how, if it be dangerous to refuse them? Shall we risk for them that which the Duke of Wellington, to his honour, pronounced the most dreadful of all calamities, Civil War? Let us look at the question fairly. Are we prepared to fight for these Irish abuses? Are we to be arrayed against each other in order to force on the Irish people unequal laws, and a Church, which is worse than useless to the millions on whom it is enforced? These are questions which must be fairly put to the English people. We must not be deceived as to our real state. The elements of political convulsion are abundant in Ireland. We refer the doubtful on this point, not to Mr. O'Connell, nor to the Repeal Association, but to that most important declaration from Irish members, not

Repealers, which was published at the close of the last session of parliament. The gentlemen who signed that document represent Irish constituencies; they tell the English people what they desire; they warn (not insolently, and as those who would defy and provoke, but wisely, as those who would win and convince) the English people of the dangerous state of Ireland. Shall we drive these men, a numerous and most influential class, into the ranks of the Repealers, by convincing them that we are not disposed, and do not mean to do justice? We may depend upon it, Ireland will not be an exception to the general law, which history shows has always governed oppressed nations. When the English Tories were madly plunging into war against France, and were levelling every barrier of the Constitution in order to prevent the public condemnation of their selfish and iniquitous measures, Mr. Fox declared the question of "resistance to be one of expediency." Millions in Ireland think so now. To a Tory government in Ireland, soldiers and fortifications are the necessary substitutes for the Constable and the law. Let us however remember that a nation held by such means is not governed, but conquered. The law by which she is held is the law of force, which we apply to the unreasoning savage, but never systematically, save when commonwealths decay, to the restraining of civilized men. The state of Ireland is monstrous. All history teaches us that a people are what the laws make them. Not only, in the language of Gibbon, "do the laws form the must instructive portion of the history of a nation," but they form the people themselves. In the laws which we have imposed upon Ireland we may discover the true reason of her deplorable condition. With the exception of the bloody and disgraceful codes which the Slave States of Republican America have framed, in order to restrain their negro population, we know of none so selfish and so cruel as those which are to be found in the Irish Statutes. From Strongbow to Victoria, from the reward for the head of an Irish Chieftain down to the Coercion and the Arms Bill, the laws are generally of a character which produces revengeful slaves, not peaceful freemen. That which Burke calls a most instructive sight to behold, "the first principle of right springing up, involved in superstition and polluted with violence, until by length of time and favourable circumstances it has worked itself into clearness," —this sight, so full of the highest interest, has never been seen in Ireland. For six centuries she has been under our dominion, and there is yet no clearness. She has been a conquered province, not an integral portion of our state. She is, however, growing beyond the dimensions of her fetters: increase them as

we will, we strive against nature—the expansive national will must force them, unless we quietly, and in time, assent to their removal. There are exceptions to all general rules; and Ireland is not an exception to *this* rule. When the Irish people became formidable, by reason of our foreign wars and their own miseries and determination, we find a memorable exception to the rule.

The epoch of the Dungannon Convention is the first period during a long night of wrong and endurance in which we see a disposition in our law-makers to govern Ireland on principles approaching to mercy and Justice. What Ireland gained then, by the attitude assumed by her volunteers, she did not improve; the hopes which dawned in 1782 expired in the ill-fated and ill-advised struggle of 1798 (a struggle be it always remembered provoked by the Government), and her hopes, and her career, as an independent state, were at once extinguished, by a series of the most infamous corruptions, pecuniary and otherwise, ever recorded in the annals of the World. The spirit pervading all the laws of which we have been writing, still shows its original bitterness in our legislature. That which others have been discreet enough to conceal, or only to avow in legislative acts, Lord Stanley with characteristic rashness has openly avowed in his place in the House of Commons. No Irishman is likely to forget the memorable declaration, that it was necessary for governments to be feared before they could be loved. We thus possess the key which enables us to decypher his policy and that of his colleagues, and these words furnish an indubitable commentary not only upon the principles by which he would govern Ireland, but also upon those, under which we presume he would administer his colonial Governments. Unhappy Ireland has not yet read the first chapter in Lord Stanley's political Catechism. She has not yet learned *to fear*. True it is that we have often by our injustice goaded her into rebellion; true it is, we have time after time confiscated the property of her people for rebelling; true it is, "and pity 'tis 'tis true," we have sent troops to live in free quarters on her people,—that we have occasionally suspended even the *forms* of law, and given her inhabitants over to military execution,—that we have sanctioned the triangle, and some of our more zealous functionaries have resorted to the pitch cap, but as yet Ireland has not learned Lord Stanley's first lesson in love; she has given in return for the laws of the Conqueror which we have imposed, hatred and scorn and revenge, but never yet has she feared us. What a world of error and misery did Lord Stanley evoke in that terrible sentence! Though we have not

made the Irish fear, the Irish have occasionally given us uneasy feelings. When the eighty thousand armed men at Dungannon began to think that they had a country to protect, and rights withheld which they ought to enjoy; and later, when the Soldiers are said to have saluted the champion of emancipation, we yielded without grace to fear, that which we had denied to justice; and the natural consequences waited on our acts,—they were received without respect or gratitude: we had significant hints that our policy was understood, that we had laid bare the path to the citadel, and had disclosed to the Irish people the only method by which a wronged nation could hope to obtain Justice from the Tory Governments of England.

Here we have the true secret of all the political agitation of the Country. O'Connell represents and so far has guided into peaceful channels that which would otherwise become outrage. He knows his Countrymen. He has the deepest interest in peace; he knows that the words of the Roman Satirist cannot be applied to his Countrymen—

"Spoliatis arma supersunt."

If the Tories put the hearts of Ireland into the Goal of Carrickfergus, we fervently hope that, in this respect, his voice will still prevail from those dreary walls, and his countrymen never be tempted to the slightest violation of the laws. We are aware that our subject has run away with us, and that we have forsaken our text. One word, however, of solemn warning, and we shall not have wasted our time if this warning be well studied; it is worth it. Rulers and people may gather wisdom from its philosophy, and though strictly applicable to our purpose, it will probably command the deeper attention because it was not written for any event of these days, but as a commentary on the sufferings of the Commons of Rome, centuries before the Christian era. It shows the ultimate consequences of the causes which have long been at the root of all the miseries of Ireland. We quote from the pages of a writer whose mortal career was closed too early for letters and for his country, one of whom his friend, the Editor of the posthumous volume of his History, most truly says, "He did indeed yearn after truth and righteousness, with yearnings that could hardly be uttered: and to hear of falsehood, to hear of injustice, pained him like a blow." During the heat of one of Wellington's great battles, certain soldiers of either army refrained from the strife, and by mutual consent, drank from the same peaceful stream. Come, then, Tories and Whigs, Radicals and Repealers, come and drink from the fountain opened by Dr.

Arnold, the historian of Rome; come and drink, and let the eternal truths of political philosophy, wrought out of the experience and miseries of ages that are past, be the medicine and healing of the ages that are to come!

"It has been well said that long periods of general suffering make far less impression on our minds, than the short sharp struggle in which a few distinguished individuals perish; not that we over estimate the horror and guilt of times of open bloodshedding, but we are much too patient of the greater misery and greater sin of periods of quiet legalised oppression; of that most deadly of all evils, when law, and even religion herself, are false to their divine origin and purpose, and their voice is no longer the voice of God, but of his enemy. In such cases the evil derives advantage, in a manner, from the very amount of its own enormity. No pen can record, no volume can contain, the details of the daily and hourly sufferings of a whole people, endured without intermission, through the whole life of man, from the cradle to the grave. The mind itself can scarcely comprehend the wide range of the mischief: how constant poverty and insult, long endured as the natural portion of a degraded caste, bear with them to the sufferers something yet worse than pain, whether of the body or the feelings; how ignorance and ill-treatment combined are the parents of universal suspicion; how from oppression is produced habitual cowardice, breaking out when occasion offers into merciless cruelty; how slaves become naturally liars; how they, whose condition denies them all noble enjoyments, and to whom looking forward is only despair, plunge themselves with a brute's recklessness, into the lowest sensual pleasures; how the domestic circle itself, the last sanctuary of human virtue, becomes at length corrupted, and in the place of natural affection and parental care, there is to be seen only selfishness and unkindness, and no other anxiety on the part of the parents for their children, than that they may, by fraud or by violence, prey in their turn upon that society which they have found their bitterest enemy. Evils like these, long working in the heart of a nation, render their own cure impossible: a revolution may execute judgment on one generation, and that perhaps the very one which was beginning to see and to repent of its inherited sins; but it cannot restore life to the morally dead; and its ill success, as if in this line of evils no curse should be wanting, is pleaded by other oppressors as a defence of their own iniquity, and a reason for perpetuating it for ever."—Vol. ii. p. 19.

ART. VII.—THE CRITICAL AND MISCELLANEOUS WRITINGS OF THEODORE PARKER, Minister of the Second Church in Roxbury. Boston: Monroe. London: John Green. 1843.

THE charm of this book is its perfect freedom. Mr. Parker writes without a single manacle of any kind—even the manacle of prudence. Let people say what they will about the slavery in which Public opinion holds Private opinion in the United States, there are no freer, or more honest books published in the English Language, than those which reach us from America. The whole atmosphere of educated Society in England is conservative. It is only the ignorant who are bold among *us*. When a man has acquired a little knowledge and experience, can number a few more years, and perhaps a few more acres, he begins to hesitate about flinging firebrands around him so bountifully as of yore, and does not deem his being in earnest (still less his being in sport) a sufficient reason for so doing. But Mr. Parker has no such hesitation. He looks upon his fire-brands as mere lucifer-matches, which he hopes will kindle a more enduring light in many a bosom. And indeed we ourselves have a perfect faith, that though they may scorch a little in some quarters where they will fall, the warmth and radiance which they bring with them will do more good, than their small amount of destructive qualities will do evil.

The Book before us consists of twelve articles, all of which, with one exception, have been published before, chiefly in the Dial, and in the Christian Examiner. They are most of them worthy of the less evanescent form which they have now received: and the enumeration of some of the Titles will show that the themes which they handle are not without significance—The permanent and transient in Religion—Education of the labouring Class—German Literature—How to move the World—Primitive Christianity, and Strauss's Life of Jesus. From the article on German Literature we extract the witty exordium, intended no doubt to have the effect, as it ought to have, of a grave remonstrance.

"Opinions are divided respecting German Literature. If we are to believe what is currently reported, and generally credited, there is, somewhere in New England, a faction of discontented men and maidens, who have conspired to love everything Teutonic, from Dutch skates to German infidelity, It is supposed, at least asserted, that these misguided persons would fain banish all other literature clean out of space;

or at the very least, would give it precedence of all other letters, ancient or modern. Whatever is German, they admire; philosophy, dramas, theology, novels, old ballads, and modern sonnets; histories and dissertations and sermons; but above all, the immoral and irreligious writings, which it is supposed the Germans are chiefly engaged in writing, with the generous intention of corrupting the youth of the world, restoring the worship of—or Pan or the Pope—it is not decided which is to receive the honour of universal homage,—and thus, gradually preparing for the kingdom of Misrule, and the dominion of Chaos, and 'most ancient Night.' It is often charitably taken for granted, that the lovers of German works on Philosophy and Art amongst us are moved thereto, either by a disinterested love of whatever is German, or else, which is the more likely, by a disinterested love of evil, and the instigation of the devil, who, it is gravely said, has actually inspired several of the most esteemed writers of that nation. The German epidemic, we are told, extends very wide. It has entered the boarding-schools for young misses, of either sex, and committed the most frightful ravages therein. We have been apprized that it has sometimes seized upon a College, nay, on Universities, and both the Faculty and the Corporation, have exhibited symptoms of the fatal disease. Colleges, did we say?

"'No place is sacred, not the Church is free.'

"It has attacked clergymen in silk and lawn. The Doctors of Divinity fall before it. It is thought that,

> 'Fever and ague, jaundice and catarrh,
> The grim-look'd tyrant's heavy horse of war
> And apoplexies, those light troops of death,
> That use small ceremony with our breath,'

are all nothing to the German epidemic. We meet men with umbrellas and over-shoes, men 'shawled to the teeth,' and suppose they are prudent persons, who have put on armour against this subtle foe. Histories of this plague, as of the cholera, have been written; the public has often been called to defend itself from the enemy, and quarantine regulations are put in force against all suspected of the infection. In short the prudent men of the land, men wise to foresee and curious to prevent evil, have not failed to advise the public from time to time of the danger that is imminent, and to recommend certain talismans as effectual safeguards. We think a copy of the 'Westminster Catechism'—or the 'Athanasian Creed,' perhaps if hung about the neck," &c.

"But a more important specific has occurred to us, which we have never known to fail, and it has been tried in a great many cases, in both hemispheres. The remedy is simple; it is a strong infusion of Dulness."—p. 27.

To this well-sustained vein of irony succeeds a high and just eulogy on the labours of the German scholars, sometimes indeed stretching the chord a little too tight we think, or to use our

author's expression, "'going too far,' which means, in plain English, farther than their critic."

An example. "Take Kant alone, and in the whole compass of thought, we scarce know his superior. From Aristotle to Leibnitz, we do not find his equal. No, nor since Leibnitz. Need we say it? *Was there not many a Lord Bacon in Immanuel Kant*?" Here, we confess, our author touches us. The force of tension can no further go. We know something of Bacon (whom elsewhere Mr. Parker directly depreciates), and we know but little of Kant. Therefore we measure no swords with Mr. Parker. But, should we live a quarter of a century longer, we will certainly during the interim, work thoroughly at Kant, if it were only on Mr. Parker's recommendation, and to make the thing complete, do so in the midst of some Hercynian Forest, to boot.

Here is a clever remark on the danger of excess in any direction:—

"No doubt there is danger in studying these writings," (those of the German scholars,) "just as there is danger in reading Copernicus, or Locke, Aristotle or Lord Brougham, or Isaiah and St. John. As a jocose friend says, 'it is always dangerous for a young man to think, for he may think wrong, you know.' It were sad to see men run mad after German Philosophy; but it is equally sad to see them go to the same excess in English Philosophy. If 'Transcendentalism' is bad, so is Paleyism, and Materalism. Truth is possessed entire by no sect, German or English. It requires all schools to get at all Truth, as the whole Church is needed to preach the whole Gospel."

We are glad to see from an admirer something like a frank allowance of Goethe's great defects of character—for this in our experience has been rare. "That Goethe, as a man, was selfish to a very high degree, a debauchee and well-bred epicurean, who had little sympathy with what was highest in man, so long as he could crown himself with rosebuds, we are willing to admit. But let him have justice, nevertheless." Much as we admire the extraordinary genius of Goethe, we cannot but think that such an admission as the above when made (and how can it be withheld?) proves the erroneousness of an estimate of him by an accomplished German scholar, and well-known writer of this country which we remember to have heard: "He is a colossal Intellect, that overlooks everything."

In the Paper on "Pharisees" there is a great deal of well-placed severity. Our author deals his blows all round, but *è contrario* to the usual mode of pugilists, you had need to stand very near him indeed to escape a hit, only a very trifling devia-

tion from the circle of the Parkerian standard is safe. The poor man who believes in the plenary Inspiration of David, Peter, and Paul, Matthew and Luke, John and Mark, Mr. Parker classes under the head of Pharisees of the Pulpit. Both Pharisee and Infidel are ugly names, and we should be careful how we use either of them merely for a difference of opinion.

Any one who is not already aware in how fine and reasonable a dress Trinitarianism can be decked out, and who would like to see an outline of the philosophical history of the notions which have prevailed on the person of Christ, will be much instructed by a reference to the article on Dorner's Christology. The Review of Strauss is very able, and as far as our knowledge of the original work carries us, very faithful. The remarks of Mr. Parker on his general Theory strike us also as very sound, and extremely cogent. The article was prepared for the Christian Examiner, and is constructive. For the destructive articles the reader must look among those prepared for the Dial. We have only room for one passage of successful banter on the mythical principle, by which the learned author of the Leben Jesu has been betrayed into his singular interpretations of the Gospel Narrative.

" Mr. Strauss takes the idea, which forms the subject, as he thinks, of a Christian myth, out of the air, and then tells us how the myth itself grew out of that idea. But he does not always prove from history or the nature of things, that the idea existed before the story or the fact was invented. He finds certain opinions, prophecies, and expectations in the Old Testament, and affirms at once, these were both the occasion and cause of the later stories, in which they reappear. This method of treatment requires very little ingenuity, on the part of the Critic : we could resolve half of Luther's life into a series of myths, formed after the model of Paul's History ; indeed this has already been done. Nay, we could dissolve any given historical event in a mythical solution, and then precipitate the ' seminal ideas' in their primitive form. We also can change an historical character into a symbol of ' universal humanity.' The whole history of the United States of America, for example, we might call a tissue of mythical stories, borrowed in part from the Old Testament, in part from the Apocalypse, and in part from the fancy. The British Government oppressing the Puritans, is the ' great red Dragon' of the Revelation, as it is shown by the national arms, and by the British legend of St. George and the Dragon. The splendid career of the new people, is borrowed from the persecuted woman's poetical history ; her dress—' clothed with the sun,' " &c., &c. " The story of the Declaration of Independence, is liable to many objections, if we examine it *a la mode* Strauss. The Congress was held at a mythical town, whose very name is suspicious, —Philadelphia, Brotherly Love. The date is suspicious; it was the

fourth day of the *fourth* month, (reckoning from *April*, as it is probable the Heraclidæ and Scandinavians; possible that the aboriginal Americans, and certain that the Hebrews did). Now *four* was a sacred number with the Americans; the President was chosen for *four* years; there were *four* departments of affairs; *four* divisions of the political powers, namely, the people, the congress, the executive, and the judiciary, &c. Besides, which is still more incredible, three of the Presidents, two of whom it is alleged signed the Declaration, died on the *fourth* of July, and the two latter exactly *fifty* years after they had signed it, and about the *same hour* of the day. The *year* also is suspicious; 1776 is but an ingenious combination of the sacred number, *four*, which is repeated *three* times, and then multiplied by itself to produce the date; thus $444 \times 4 = 1776$, Q.E.D."——" Still farther, the Declaration is metaphysical, and presupposes an acquaintance with the Transcendental philosophy on the part of the American people. Now the Kritik of Pure Reason was not published till after the Declaration was made. Still farther, the Americans were never, to use the nebulous expressions of certain philosophers, an 'idealo-transcendental-and-subjective,' but 'an objective-and-concretivo-practical' people, to the last degree; therefore a metaphysical document, and most of all, a 'legal-congressional-metaphysical' document, is highly suspicious if found among them. Besides, Hualteperah, the great historian of Mexico, a neighbouring state, never mentions this document; and farther still, if this Declaration had been made, and accepted by the whole nation, as it is pretended, then we cannot account for the fact, that the fundamental maxim of that Paper, namely, the soul's equality to itself, 'all men are born free and equal,' was perpetually lost sight of, and a large portion of the people kept in slavery; still later, petitions—supported by this fundamental article—for the abolition of slavery, were rejected by Congress with unexampled contempt, when, if the history is not mythical, slavery never had a legal existence after 1776, &c. &c."—p. 301.

Of the nature and staple of the "Life of St. Bernard of Clairvaux," we can give our readers an idea in one sentence. It is an article which would have graced any number of the Edinburgh Review, and is written in the school of Macaulay. Excellent as it is, and some other of the papers are, which we do not now specifically notice, it contains nothing particularly characteristic of Mr. Parker's idiosyncracy as a Christian Theologian, and to a rough and vague estimate, or rather query into this, we are anxious to devote our remaining space.

We confess a large amount of sympathy with Mr. Parker. We are, like Coleridge, no friends to Bibliolatry. We think that what he and others say of Christianity being spirit and not letter, is undeniable.

We cannot consent to suspend Christianity on the infallibility of particular men; or the exact accuracy of particular narratives. Let criticism do its worst, or its best, and we shall still

believe in Christ, and receive the Christian Religion as a reality. The assertion that the apostles were not absolutely infallible, and that the truth of the books even of the New Testament, is not unmixed, does not move us. We can hold ourselves free to criticize certain statements of the Gospels, and certain ideas in the Epistles, even while we acknowledge ourselves to be sworn servants of Christ. We believe that there will be left enough that is self-dependent, and in its own nature indisputable and eternal, in the Christian Records, even after criticism has done its best or its worst.

But while conceding thus much to our Author, and to his school, we cannot feel so indifferent, as (if we wrong him not) he seems to be, to the solution of the question, what *is* the precise authority to be attributed to the Books of the New Testament, to any, or to all of them? For, regard them in what other light we may, we must acknowledge them to be the sole original sources of our knowledge, and of our ideas of the life and teachings of Jesus Christ. The Christian Scriptures are to the Christian, what Locke represented Sensation to be to the Understanding. If they are not the limit, they are at least the standard, the original, of our faith. We may build much upon this foundation, as, according to Locke's philosophy, the intellect builds much on the foundation supplied it by the senses. But, according to our apprehension, our Christianity would have become just as much a non-entity without the New Testament, as, in Locke's apprehension, the understanding would be a non-entity without the senses.

And yet Mr. Parker says—"So, if it could be proved,—as it cannot—in opposition to the greatest amount of historical evidence ever collected on any similar point, that the Gospels were the fabrication of designing and artful men, that Jesus of Nazareth had never lived, still Christianity would stand firm, and fear no evil. None of the doctrines of that religion would fall to the ground; for, if true, they stand by themselves. But we should lose—oh! irreparable loss! the example of that character, so beautiful, so divine, that no human genius could have conceived it, as none, after all the progress and refinement of eighteen centuries, seems fully to have comprehended its lustrous life."

"Christianity would stand firm and fear no evil"—"none of the doctrines of that religion would fall to the ground"—"even though it could be proved that Jesus of Nazareth had never lived," and "that the gospels were the fabrication of designing and artful men!" No one can accuse our author of want of faith. He would believe the thing, though it did not exist. He

would receive, as forming a divine religion, principles whose only original vehicles to us of this age are documents fabricated by artful and designing men! Not one of the doctrines of the Christian religion would, in his estimation, fall to the ground, though the person, through the events and actions of whose life, and the words of whose lips those doctrines were alone unfolded, had never lived!

But we understand Mr. Parker perfectly well. He is the centre, as every thinking man is more or less, of his own system. He has a heart of piety and religion within him, and to this heart he gathers (from whatever quarter) all things that assimilate to it, and from this heart he expels all things that are abhorrent to it. And whether he finds what is abhorrent in the sacred books of the Christian, or what is akin in the legends of artful and designing men, he alike rejects the first and accepts the last without scruple. Thus to him it is the same thing, whether a thing is historically true or historically false. He merely looks to see whether it is morally true, that is, congenial to his own religious and devotional idiosyncracy.

All this is perfectly intelligible, but it makes our author's theology, as it would make any other man's, entirely personal. It consists properly speaking but of one principle. Be an eclectic according to your own conscience. Take your religion from where you can get it. You will find the most valuable material in the Bible: but don't trust implicitly to a single fact, sentiment, or statement as recorded in it, because I cannot guarantee the fact as a reality, the statement as correct, or the sentiment as necessarily true. According to an enumeration of the liabilities of the Evangelists to mistake, which our author gives (p. 248, 249) in his Discourses on Religion, published in Boston in 1842, it would seem a miracle if anything like a trustworthy statement remained in their records. For he tells us, how they might have omitted many things which Jesus said and did, *important in estimating* his doctrines—how they could only tell what they knew—how they might not always understand, and might sometimes mistake, their teacher's opinions—how they might have exaggerated (unconsciously) or derived from mere hearsay particular facts—how they might confound their own notions with his, or confound fact with fancy, and represent him as teaching what he did not teach—and so on through two pages of perils.

We think from such passages in Mr. Parker's writings as these we are not wrong in collecting it as his opinion, that no books of the Old or the New Testament are, strictly speaking, possessed of any *authority* whatever. He regards them simply

as containing *materials* for religion, just as the British Museum contains *materials* for Science. Just as Science, therefore, would have existed, though the British Museum had never been collected, so Religion, nay, and Christianity, according to Mr. Parker, would have existed, though no Gospels had ever been penned, and Christ had never lived.

According to this idea of his views, then, Mr. Parker is his own master. He acknowledges no other. He is glad to avail himself of the theological assistance, and especially of the moral example, of Jesus, as his elder brother and his friend, but he does not profess to regard him as Master. Nor does he acknowledge his authority, or any authority but that of his own judgment exercised upon the reported doctrines of Jesus, as on the reported doctrines of any other Teacher. Now we need not stop to say, this is not enough for us. We recognize Jesus as *bonâ fide* our Divine Master and Leader, and the New Testament as containing the Law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus: accompanying this declaration, however, with the remark, that as in America there are two kinds of Masters, and as in England there two kinds of Law; so we serve Jesus as a free servant, acting with a conscience, and not as a slave; and we interpret his Law according to the Spirit of the Christian constitution, and not technically, according to the demands of the letter of each separate law, in whatever age enacted. Here we think is the difference between a personal and a general Theology. Every man's religion, and to a great extent his theology too, must at last be personal; because the conscience of each man is his own ultimate appeal. But a man may take a stand-point, on which others can stand with him, or he may take one on which there is only room for himself.

But Mr. Parker does recognize a standard, which is Christianity, and notwithstanding all his professions of freedom he recognizes an authority and a Master too. Many as are the perils to which the Evangelists were subject, he evidently thinks that they escaped from them without material injury. He is imbued with the very spirit of Christianity, and looks upon it as his all. And this makes his inconsistency in thinking that he could dispense with the books of the New Testament, nay, with Christ himself, and yet that Christianity would stand firm, and none of its doctrines be lost, the more glaring.

He grants, for instance (p. 153), that Christianity "depends on this collection of Books for the historical statement of its facts." Good. And does it not also depend upon them for the statement of its doctrines? He grants that Jesus "was the organ through which the Infinite spoke." Good. But we must

have some certain knowledge that Jesus did speak, and also what he spoke, or the Infinite does not speak to us in him at all. He says that even if the Gospels had been the work of artful and designing men, and Christ had never lived, none of the doctrines of Christianity would fall to the ground. In the name of all that is ingenious where would Mr. Parker have got the doctrines from, unless they are only bare Deism, if he had only a fabrication and a falsehood to go to for them? Mr. P. speaks of the words of Jesus as "the music of Heaven, sung in an earthly voice, and the echo of these words in John and Paul owe their efficacy to their truth and their depth, and to no accidental matter connected therewith." Good. But we must implore Mr. Parker to inform us whence he would have got these words, or their echoes, if he had not the Gospels and Epistles to go to, or could not substantially trust them, when he did go to them?

In the paper on Primitive Christianity, our Author says of Jesus (p. 228), "Because he was faithful God inspired him, till his judgment in religious matters, seems to have become certain as instinct, infallible as the law of gravitation, and his will irresistible, because it was no longer partial, but God's will flowing through him." This is hearty, and we go heartily along with it.

The interpretation of these apparent inconsistencies is, that the Essays of which this volume consists, were composed at different times and in different states of mind—sometimes the critical, and sometimes the devotional element predominating. But though the Author's position is no doubt clear to his own mind, we do not see that he can make it so to others, until he can decide that very question which he holds in such contempt,—what is the *authority* of the books of the New Testament? As yet we wait the hour and the man.

To give some idea of Mr. Parker's reverence for our Lord, we quote, in conclusion, from the Sermon on the Transient and Permanent in Christianity, to several short passages in which we have already referred:—

"How vast has his (Christ's) influence been! How his spirit wrought in the hearts of his disciples, rude, selfish, bigoted as at first they were. How it has wrought in the world. His words judge the nations. The wisest son of man has not measured their height. They speak to what is deepest in profound men; what is holiest in good men; what is divinest in religious men. They kindle anew the flame of devotion in hearts long cold. They are Spirit and Life. His truth was not derived from Moses and Solomon; but the light of God shone through him, not coloured, not bent aside. His life is the perpetual rebuke of all time since. It condemns ancient civilization; it condemns modern

civilization. Wise men we have since had, and good men; but this Galilean youth strode before the world whole thousands of years—so much of Divinity was in him. His words solve the questions of this present age. In him the Godlike and the Human met and embraced, and a divine life was born. Measure him by the world's greatest sons; how poor they are. Try him by the best of men—how little and low they appear. Exalt him as much as we may, we shall yet, perhaps, come short of the mark. But still was he not our brother? the son of man as we are; the son of God like ourselves? His excellence, was it not human excellence? His wisdom, love, piety—sweet and celestial as they were—are they not also what we may attain? In him, as in a mirror, we may see the image of God, and go on from glory to glory, till we are changed into the same image, led by the Spirit which enlightens the humble. Viewed in this way, how beautiful is the life of Jesus. Heaven has come down to earth, or rather earth has become heaven. The Son of God, come of age, has taken possession of his birthright. The brightest revelation is this—of what is possible for all men, if not now, at least hereafter."

He, of whom all this can be said, exercises an authority over our feelings, yea, and our faith too, and we have no choice but to bow before him as our Master.

C. W.

ART. VIII.—RELIGIOUS UNION, WITH INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM: A Letter addressed to the Congregation worshipping in the Unitarian Chapel, Union-Street, Glasgow. By JOHN TAYLOR. London: 1844.

WE are sorry that the real question involved in the discussions of this Letter, namely, the occupancy of the Pulpit by Anti-supernaturalists in Congregations uniting for worship and instruction on the basis of Christianity, should be brought before the public in connection with the affairs of a particular religious Society. Mr. Taylor is not to blame for this, for the difficulties of his position had been made public without his knowledge or consent. We deprecate all external interference in cases of this kind,—all attempt to determine by the opinion of a Body what ought to be the relations between a particular Minister and his people,—and we are sure that apart from a consideration of his Christian spirit, life, influence, and preaching, the bare question of his Anti-Supernaturalism, as unfitting him for the office of an awakener and sustainer of Christian affections and purposes, cannot properly be discussed. Only those in the most intimate union with him are qualified to determine what virtue proceeds from him, or how far his Anti-Supernaturalism neutralises or destroys his Christian power. We could not, on dogmatic grounds, reasonably ask a Congregation to part with a Minister who weekly stirred their hearts as with a trumpet, and made God, and Christian excellence, and the life eternal, more of realities to them than ever they had been before.

We think that Mr. Taylor has not made sufficiently prominent and distinct the question at issue between him and his Congregation, viz., whether a Minister holding the opinions which he professes can satisfactorily conduct the worship of a Congregation who acknowledge a peculiar virtue in the influences and facts of Christianity. This question Mr. Taylor has throughout confused with another, on which we apprehend he would find no Unitarian to disagree with him, namely, the accordance of equal privileges and equal respect to every member of a worshipping society, whatever may be his peculiar sentiments. If a Deist joins in religious communion with a Congregation of Unitarian Christians, let the spiritual fellowship be made as extensive as possible, and the sense of separation and difference be never painfully or disrespectfully obtruded upon him,—but he will no more expect that such Congregation shall cease from

the contemplation of views which they deem true, and the observance of forms which they feel to be significant, than he will be ready to have other men's truths and modes of worship forced upon his own conscience. If they are to be denied the contemplation of Christian facts, and the use of Christian ordinances, because a pure Theist joins them, they are abridged in their Christian liberties to the measure of his creed, and one man assumes to withhold the views and influences for which every other soul is hungering. If a Deist unites himself to a Christian Congregation, let him be as a brother, a participator in their every act and privilege, as far as he himself is willing, and let no invidious notice be drawn upon him when he separates from his fellow-worshippers, as for example at the celebration of the Lord's Supper (not that this would necessarily show Deism),—but if from the pew he claims the Pulpit, and says, 'I will not only join in your worship and instruction on equal terms, but I will direct it,—and I will withhold all allusions to what you deem Christian influences, and keep back the *positive* faith which you feel to be nourishing,—and if you deny me this you are abridging my natural privileges,'—we cannot conceive a more preposterous claim to come from a clear-headed man. What natural privilege can any man have to be the Minister of a Society, to whose peculiar religious position, and spiritual wants, his Ministrations are no longer felt to be suitable? To deny him *membership*, if he wished to claim it, would be disgraceful intolerance; but to deny him the power of withholding from them the spiritual facts and contemplations which they experience to be most vital, is not only their Right but their Duty. Now Mr. Taylor states the case only as it relates to a member, and leaves the impression that his inference is, though he does not distinctly say so, that the right to be a member involves injustice on the part of a Congregation if, on account of their totally different methods of looking upon Christianity, they consider him an unsuitable person for the occupancy of their pulpit. Surely the faith of one man has no natural privilege to extinguish the desires and longings of a Congregation for such spiritual nourishment as suits them best. If, independently of all dogmatic grounds, a majority are satisfied with his ministrations, they will retain him as their Minister, —but if he does not meet their religious wants, whatever be the cause, they will remove him,—and no man can pretend that by this his liberty is violated.

Mr. Taylor, then, does not state the case with a sufficient closeness of relation to his own position when he says that, "unless Unitarians are prepared to fashion the constitution of

their religious Societies so as to admit the Theist to equal privileges, and to show that no member of such societies shall lose any rights which he once enjoyed, by the mere rejection of the miraculous element in Christian history, they will prove themselves to be virtually as narrow and intolerant as any other portion of the so-called religious world, and by far the most inconsistent of all the sects into which that world is divided." Except in the case of restrictive Trust Deeds, which we shall speak of presently, we never heard of a Unitarian Society abridging the rights of a member on any grounds whatever. The possession of the pulpit cannot be considered as one of those rights: that must be determined, in every case, simply by the wishes of a majority of the Congregation. If, indeed, a Congregation unite on a basis of positive faith, and, by restrictions, introduced into their Trust Deeds, attempt to confine their endowments to men holding their own opinions, and so bind down their successors by virtual pains and penalties, we do not see how such a case can be distinguished from common Creed-making, nor how such a constitution of a religious society can proceed from men professing any reverence for freedom of inquiry. If by any change in their views, since the date of their foundation, such a society begins to feel the self-imposed trammels of their Constitution, by all means let them remodel it, so far as the law will permit,—and let no *Minority*, for their own benefit, take advantage of restrictions, which ought never to have existed. The majority of a Congregation, for the time being, should controul the instructions of the Pulpit simply by the election of the Minister, handing down that privilege to their Successors as unrestricted as they found it. In this way a Congregation has a succession of members who become the natural inheritors and developers of their forefathers' faith, and frequent and violent changes are out of nature. Of course where Chapel property is held on trust, the Trustees are bound to enforce the conditions of the Trust, in whatever short-sighted violation of first principles it may have been devised. In what respect these general principles apply to the case of the Glasgow Congregation, we are not informed. In the following views of Mr. Taylor respecting the Constitution of worshipping societies, in so far as the rights of free inquiry, and the controul of the property (not the absolute cession of it as he, no doubt inadvertently, puts it) by the majority are concerned, we entirely concur.

"A consistent vindication of the wedded union of intellectual liberty and religious sentiment by the Unitarian body, involves such a constitution of worshipping societies as shall not deprive any of their

members of their right to property dedicated to religious worship, though they should pass from faith in supernatural revelations to a simple and ennobling Theism, and believe that the stars of heaven and the flowers of the earth, the natural intuitions of the intellect and the strong affections of the soul, the mechanism of the human frame and the experiences of human life, teach diviner lessons than all the miracles that ignorance, poetry, and false philosophy have ever invented.

"To such places of worship, therefore, as are held by Unitarians on the principle of respect to the rights of free inquiry, the anti-supernatural portion of any worshipping society have a right, equally with those who believe in miracles; and to them, if a majority, such property must be allowed to devolve, unless, indeed, Unitarians are prepared to stultify their own maxims, and contradict their own professions."—p. 32.

We may be doing Mr. Taylor an injustice in supposing it to be his view, (collected by us from his Letter,) that a Christian congregation would violate the rights of free inquiry by wishing to remove an Anti-Supernaturalist from the occupation of its pulpit,—for we find him distinctly stating his own insuperable objections to minister to a Congregation whose doctrinal basis of union contained more propositions than are absolutely necessary for the existence of religious affections. He may only intend to condemn their constitution so far as *membership* is concerned, and to avow his own inability to be the religious teacher of a Society in which the facts of Christianity are regarded as important spiritual influences. If this be his meaning we agree with him, that the constitution should permit a controlling power to the majority; and we also agree with him that he cannot satisfactorily be the permanent minister of a Congregation which wishes for an administration of Christianity which he cannot conscientiously give,—but in this latter case we attach no blame to either party. We do not blame a Calvinist Congregation for chosing a Calvinist Minister, but for using any external influences to keep themselves and their successors Calvinists for ever. And no blame can attach to Unitarians for requiring in their minister a positive faith in Christianity, provided their constitution is free, and they employ no outward means to trammel themselves or their posterity. If the following passage contains no allegation of the violation of freedom of inquiry by Unitarians, when they choose a minister suited to their *existing* wants, it seems to us entirely unexceptionable, —though indeed a doubt might be raised whether Mr. Taylor was justified in compelling a Congregation to act in rigid consistency with their defined basis, if they were willing, by retaining his ministrations, to overstep it:—

"In accordance with the principles thus laid down, as constituting the basis of religious union, and distinguishing a truly Catholic Church, I cannot continue to be the permanent minister of any society which insists on maintaining a narrower basis, and excludes from equal privileges and equal rights any one who bearing the name of Theist, or Rationalist, or Anti-Supernatural Christian, wishes to cultivate his religious and moral affections. If I am to occupy the position of religious and moral teacher to any society, it must be to a society which allows of a different belief in its members on many points; which does not blame men for differing from it according to evidence satisfactory to themselves; and which requires only for religious union that without which men cannot unite in religious worship, viz., veneration for the same object of worship, and acknowledgment of the divine obligation of virtue."—p. 18.

With regard to religious union in conjunction with intellectual liberty, it should be remembered that upon those who are free from dogmatic bonds falls the responsibility of bearing with the weak brother yet in their bondage, to any extent that does not make them hypocrites or slaves. The untrammelled can go to the fettered,—but the fettered cannot go to him. The liberal may concede to the bigot, what the bigot cannot concede to him. With the free rests the responsibility of violating unity, if unnecessarily he casts the dogmatist from him. The Deist may find in the Christian all the sentiments and affections requisite for religious union, and the Christian may add to these some dogmas which the Deist does not accept,—but with the Deist will be the violation of unity if he insists on an exclusion of those Christian matters which he regards as non-essential. And if the cultivation of the religious *affections alone* was their object,—supposing these two to represent a Society, the Pulpit should be the *Christian's*, because to receive religious sentiment through the medium of Christian facts is to him a thing important, and to the Deist, so long as all religious sentiments and affections are preserved, a thing indifferent. We are supposing neither party to encroach on the conscience or rights of the other, but to be willing to unite as far as possible in religious *feelings*: the forbearance should be on the part of him whose faith contained the smallest number of positive dogmas.

So intimate, however, is the connection between right views and right affections in Religion, that no truth, or what is deemed a truth, should be concealed or kept back for the sake of union,—but neither should it be preached so as to involve a violation of inward fellowship, and make religious unity dependent on its reception.

Our view then of the Constitution of a religious Society is,

that there should be no Creed in the Trust Deed; that the majority for the time being, should rule its affairs and influence its Pulpit by the election of its Minister,—with reasonable provisions for securing that such Majority should consist of permanent and taxed Members, and not of sudden incursors into other men's property and labours.

On the question of Anti-Supernaturalism and its possible connections with a true Christian faith, we have already given our views at great length in this Journal, in the Number for April 1841. We are not Anti-Supernaturalists. We cannot account for Christ without the introduction of supernatural purpose and direction; and we cannot account for the Christian history, for the revolutions in the views and conduct of the Apostles, without the Resurrection of our Lord. But we do not presume to define Christianity for any other man; and we acknowledge all as Christians who, in the sincerity of their hearts, taking the Christ for their Teacher, Master, and Example, interpret his Religion for themselves. If indeed he ceases to be their Teacher, Master, and Example, we cease to call them Christians, for they themselves must admit that they cease to be so. No man can reasonably call himself a Christian, who believes and avows that there are important religious principles which Christianity does not recognize. Even the belief that "*Jesus was a Theist*" will not entitle him to call himself a Christian, for be cannot call *that* his RELIGION which he considers to be essentially defective in "just and philosophical and charitable principles." If he claims the name on the ground that Christ places in his hands the instrument of free Inquiry, —and teaches him "of himself to judge what is right," it is a strange anachronism to make that principle only coeval with Christianity.

And it is here that Mr. Taylor separates from us; not in relation to religious union, but in relation to our respective connections with Christianity. By professing to find it defective in important principles, he disowns it as a Religion. We do not blame him for that; it is the honest opinion of a pure, strong, earnest, and clear mind,—but it leaves him no reason for even wishing to call himself a Christian. Had he identified Christianity with his highest views of Religion, we should have vindicated his right to the name, to whatever extent we might have differed with him on external, historical, or dogmatical questions. But when he places Christianity *below* Deism, with sincere respect for his ability, his purity, and his *religious* character, and with the most earnest desire that no foreign interference may obstruct the legitimate influence of his mind on

his fellow-men and fellow-worshippers, we know of no intelligible sense in which the name of Christian designates his religious position. He may be more and better than a Christian, —that is a matter of opinion,—but Christianity no longer includes what he deems his *highest* conceptions of Religion. The passage in the Letter we principally refer to is the following:—

"The manner in which the Unitarian interprets Christianity gives him no superiority in any respect, over the views and sentiments of the Theist, who possesses all that is really valuable or good, moral or devout, reasonable or ennobling in Christianity, *along with other just and philosophical and charitable principles which cannot, without violence, be educed from it.*"—p. 30.

Mr. Taylor cites some Unitarian professions, that the right of individual judgment and free inquiry in Religion have been incorporated into the economy of Unitarianism, and asks, "How can Unitarians, without a blush, proclaim their attachment to a blended intellectual freedom and religious sentiment, unless they tolerate, admit and countenance, within their societies, the principle of *progress* in religion?" Undoubtedly if they "speak evil of the 'deep and vital religion' which pure Theism is adapted to cherish," or if they expel (which they do not) from their Societies individual members who reject the narratives of Christian Miracle, they are glaringly inconsistent, —and if there is anything in the constitution of their Societies, to prevent a legitimate majority, holding such views, to elect the Minister and occupy the Church, they have departed from their first principles; but there is no violation of first principles in a majority who regard Christianity as the highest, the absolute Religion, declining to elect as their Minister one who ranks it below pure Deism, or declining to regard Deism alone as the bond of their union. Neither violates or distrusts the principle of free inquiry: each acts according to his present *status*, without assuming it to be unchangeable. In the Resolution, quoted by Mr. Taylor, passed at the Aggregate Meeting of Unitarians in 1838, the progress expressly contemplated is *within* the bosom of Christianity; though doubtless if that progress carried them out of Christianity, the framers and supporters of that Resolution would have made no question that it was not only their Right but their Duty to act upon their Convictions, and the Duty of all other men to respect their liberties, and to speak no evil, and "think no evil," of their religious character. Here is the Resolution:—

"That this Meeting, in professing its attachment to Unitarian Chris-

tianity, as at once Scriptural and rational, and conducive to the true glory of God and well being of men, and in avowing its veneration for the early British expositors and confessors of this faith, *at the same time recognizes the essential worth of that principle of free inquiry to which we are indebted for our own form of Christianity, and of that spirit of deep and vital religion which may exist under various forms of theological sentiment,* and which gave to our forefathers their implicit faith in truth, their love of God, and their reliance for the improvement of mankind on the influences of the Gospel."—*Note* p. 24.

We would express our respectful sense of the religious, moral, and intellectual qualities which shine through this Letter. Mr. Taylor is a man whom no cause would be willing to part with. But the enemy of Christianity he never can be,—though he may think there are certain elements inseparable from it which render its worship, more or less, sectarian. Men will necessarily unite for instruction and prayer according to their religious affinities, but the true religious unity is not that which draws men together as members of the same Congregation, but that which holds them in the same supreme love of excellence, the same submission and loyalty to God, and earnest desire to be faithful to the same guiding affections. A Trinitarian and an Unitarian may have 'religious union with intellectual freedom,' though they do not meet together in Houses of worship, because the affections which they both hold supreme, the love of God and man, would not, with both, be nourished by the same Theology.

We earnestly trust that the question of Anti-Supernaturalism is not about to assume a prominent place in our Churches. It is a barren question. While the soil of humanity lies bare and neglected, are 'the sowers of the word' to spend their energies in dissecting the divine seeds of goodness? Whilst the Christianity of Creeds is active and encroaching, is the Christianity of the spirit and life of Jesus to be only critical and speculative? We do not deny the importance of such questions. But let them not become watchwords amongst us. Let not a war of opinions rage within the bosom of those whose glorious Gospel it is, that Jesus is the Son of God, and the Son of Man. Let our younger men eschew rashness, and our older men finality. It cannot be denied that there are two tendencies existing within our Churches; let them work together in prudence and simplicity until their issues appear, and not, through any want of Christian wisdom or Christian love, be forced into active opposition. But there must be no Orthodoxy within the bosom of Freedom. There is nothing in our present condition that will not lead to higher truth and good, provided we abide by

our first principles,—respect each other's rights and motives,—leave opinion and inquiry to find their natural resting-places,—and by foreign dictation interrupt no process of thought and development, working itself into light and clearness. By mutual simplicity, discretion and forbearance, "religious union" may be combined "with intellectual freedom."

Art. IX.—HOLY SONGS AND MUSICAL PRAYERS.

To the Editor of the Christian Teacher.

Sir,

In answer to a long letter from the Editor of "Holy Songs and Musical Prayers," I will reply as briefly as I can.

The work was sent to me by a friend of the Editor, begging my perusal and opinion—which was to appear in print. On opening the book I detected some wants of unity between the Poet and Musician, and I begged to decline entering upon the subject.

I was again strongly urged to criticise the work, and I endeavoured to put my remarks into the form, rather of a disquisition upon psalmody, than of an attack upon the book.

However, in my haste and love of conciseness, it appears, I have not a little disturbed the Editor, by attempting to compress into a few words, ideas spread over an extensive preface. I believe I have done it faithfully (excepting a typographical error) but certainly not in the elegant diction, and style, of the author; and I am sorry he should apprehend it possible, that my language could be attributed to his pen, as I aim not at fine writing. But now to the music, the only thing I propose to meddle with.

The Editor has not understood me. When I talk of the *form* of a word, I would convey a separate idea from its syllabic distinction, *i. e.* either long or short.

The word Apt, is musically speaking, a short syllable, and will not carry an open sound, such a one, as a musician would place on the bar. The arbitrary distinctions which classical men, or poets, make in denominating syllables long or short, have little reference to the subject we are discussing.

The word *indivisibility*, consisting of seven syllables, would be uttered musically in the same time as the monosyllable All.

The *size* of the word, must be matched with the *size* or volume of the sound.

One great defect of our language is, that we have not, words small enough—particles, to hit off our shortest notes, and a lyric poet must have an ear for music before he can construct verse, suitable for the composer.

The Editor of "Holy Songs and Musical prayers" need not take offence, at a doubt being expressed, whether some of the Hymns are adapted for musical composition, when he learns that

Milton in conjunction with Henry Laws, was engaged to give a complete version of the psalms, with new music; but as there wanted that unity, of which I have been speaking, necessary to a good effect, after the translation of nineteen psalms into miserable verse, the scheme was given up.*

It is true, I have said, that it would be as difficult to set some poems to music, as a catalogue of household furniture; but I have not said that, of Bishop Heber's hymn. My words are, It is impossible to set *hammer and chisel* to music, an expression in his poem of Palestine; and following up that idea, I said, neither is it possible to deal with the hymn page 22, written by the same pious and learned Bishop. I reiterate it. No musician can expect agreeable melody to flow from a verse in which the letter S occurs not less than fourteen times.

I remember being in St. James's Church, and on hearing the line,

"Sing songs of sacred praise,"

I was horrified by a chorus of hissing, which surpassed everything that I had heard from an army of geese in Lincolnshire.

Another irreverent effect is cast upon devotion, by the musical phrase terminating before the sense of the words. For instance: at page 17 we find a movement from Beethoven's Fidelio, pressed into the service of devotion. It is in that scene of the Opera, where the prisoners escape from the dungeon, exclaiming,—

"O what delight! to taste the sweet refreshing air!"

The four notes which inspire you with salubrious draughts of sound—to express the delight of inhaling the welcome atmosphere! are completely destroyed by their connection with the words "*Remit all our*," and this is repeated three times, though the contrary is maintained. I have heard a line of poetry sung thus, by very pious people, in a chapel at Leicester,—"Like a poor poll——Like a poor poll——Like a poor polluted worm."

These observations apply neither to the music, nor the poetry, separately: they may both be individually good—but spoilt when brought together.

The Editor speaks of the excellence of Wesley's and Doddridge's Hymns for music: nothing can be worse, except Tate, Brady, and Merrick. Watts is generally good, but none approach perfection so nearly as Mrs. Steele.

The words "spak'st," "hear'st," "mongst," and "reign'st," so completely lock up the voice in the mouth that very little sound

* Vide preface to The Sacred Melodies. 1812.

can escape. Expressions like the following are utterly destructive of air and melody;—'Poisonous error's Serpent head;' 'Messiah sent to save;' 'sleep'st like Lazarus;' 'In saddest strain our songs complain;' 'Still his people's bliss ensuring;' 'Nor let his eye see sin.'

The Editor is at much pains to prove that the Hymns in this collection scan well, and are perfect in their metrical structure. It may be so; but such expressions as the above, will never sing well.

The music, especially the harmony, I spoke of in terms of commendation, nor did I censure the poetry; but the points I have alluded to appeared to me not to have been sufficiently contemplated.

WILLIAM GARDINER.

Leicester, March 8, 1844.

Art. X.—THE BOOK DEPARTMENT OF THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

'A Second Letter to the Editor of the Christian Teacher,' on this subject, has been sent to us by the Rev. Edward Tagart, who signing himself '*Honorary Secretary*,' with the addition, in his former communication, of '*on behalf of the Association*,' removes from the Committee all responsibility for the contents of both his Letters. We sincerely regret that we were not made fully aware of this, three months ago.

Mr. Tagart sent this letter to the Editor, in a printed form, asking, though not strongly expecting, its insertion in the Christian Teacher. This we declined, for two reasons: first, it was printed already; and secondly, we could not reasonably be expected to publish libels on ourselves.

In this Letter Mr. Tagart thinks it not unbecoming his character and ours, to charge us with a want of candour,—with having forgotten the fidelity needful for an Editor,—and with misrepresentation. And to show his appreciation of the work he enters upon in the correction of these our offences, and of his own spirit in the undertaking, he selects as his motto:

"Nothing is degrading which a high and graceful purpose ennobles; and offices the most menial cease to be menial, the moment they are wrought in love."

It would be totally foreign to the spirit in which we wish to conduct this Periodical, were we, under any provocation whatever, to disgrace its pages with personal disputes. In after years it shall never pain us with the remembrance, that even justly offended feeling has had a victim in it. We, therefore, decline all further controversy, and shall only quote, in his own words, the two passages in his former communication to the Christian Teacher, on which Mr. Tagart founds his 'serious' charges. We do not, at all, dispute his own interpretation of his own words,—but we must be excused, when reading them without his aid, for having simply applied to them such knowledge and tact as we have acquired for interpreting the English language.

I. "Your observations on the poverty of the Catalogue seem to be founded on a misapprehension of the object with which that department is maintained, and the plan on which it has hitherto been conducted. The reason why the Catalogue does not contain the books which you

mention is the very obvious one that the Association does not profess to supply the Unitarian Public with works which can be equally well purchased of the Booksellers, and which could not be supplied by the Association to any advantage. The Association neither could perform, nor ever attempted to perform, the part of a general Bookseller. Its object is, as I have been accustomed to understand it, to cherish and keep before the public useful works which need its encouragement, and without its aid would sink into oblivion, or not exist at all."—p. 112.

We understood this to be an admission of such 'poverty' as we had attributed to the Catalogue of the Unitarian Association, *and an argument* that this poverty attached no culpability to the Committee, because it proceeded necessarily from the very nature and design of the Book Department. In this it appears we read the writer's mind wrongly. We are sorry for it; but still more sorry that the ordinary construction of English should involve us in heavy offences.

II. "The Catalogue must needs therefore be much the same from year to year until the said stock is disposed of. Some of their works may appear obsolete or even valueless. In point of importance and value for general circulation, they may bear no comparison with the excellent works which you mention; but you would not have them destroyed or considered as waste paper, especially as they come in well for gratuitous distribution, when the subscribers seem to be fully supplied."—p. 112.

We understood this passage to contain a concession that a stock 'which must needs be much the same from year to year until said stock was disposed of,' was, and no wonder, in some respects obsolete,—strengthened by another concession, that said stock would "bear no comparison with the excellent works" suggested by us as additions,—and closing with the mitigating plea, that such obsolete works must nevertheless appear from year to year in the Catalogue, because it would be a waste to destroy them, and 'they come in well for gratuitous distribution' to a large part of the public, long after they may be obsolete to the Subscribers. In all this, it appears we were wrong. We are sorry for it,—but, against blame, again plead the immunities of a common reader of the English Language.

"After all," it is very satisfactory to find Mr. Tagart, if again we do not misunderstand him, summing up the matter exactly as we, from the first, intended to place it,—and adding the assurance, that some members of the Committee agree with us, in our view.

"After all perhaps you only meant to say, without disrespect, that

the Catalogue of the Association might be enriched and enlarged with advantage,' and to express a strong opinion that it ought to be so. Some members of the Committee have thought so too."—*Second Letter*, p. 8.

We cannot leave the matter in a better position than this.

THE

CHRISTIAN TEACHER.

Art. I.—POPULAR EDUCATION IN EUROPE.

Seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Boston: 1844.

Last year, Mr. Horace Mann, the distinguished Secretary of the Board of Education for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, visited Europe, with the view of personally examining the nature and workings of the various systems of Public Instruction in the Old World. He "visited England, Ireland, and Scotland, crossed the German Ocean to Hamburgh, thence went to Magdeburgh, Berlin, Potsdam, Halle, and Weissenfels, in the Kingdom of Prussia; to Leipsic and Dresden, the two great cities in the Kingdom of Saxony; thence to Erfurt, Weimar, Eisenach, &c., on the great route from the Middle of Germany to Frankfort on the Maine; thence to the Grand Duchy of Nassau, of Hesse Darmstadt and of Baden, and after visiting all the principal cities in the Rhenish provinces of Prussia, passed through Holland and Belgium to Paris." We propose to follow, in his own words where we can, the course of so accomplished an observer. Few men could be found more fully qualified by knowledge and experience to report instructively the results of such an extensive inquiry.

Among the nations of Europe, Prussia and Saxony stand first, both for the quantity and the quality of the Instruction provided for their people, whilst England is the only one of the highly civilized European kingdoms which has never had any system of National Education. Yet in no country are social

inequalities so appalling,—in no country has the munificence of individuals in educational bequests been so large,—whilst in no country are the intellectual and moral interests of the People so selfishly regarded, and so unscrupulously sacrificed to the class jealousies of different sections of the Nation.

The annual income from the Endowments of England for school education may be estimated at £500,000. Some examples are given, taken from the parliamentary reports, of the wasteful expenditure of such enormous revenues.

At Dunstable, £330. 10s. annual income supports forty boys.

In Reading, £1043. 15*s*. 9*d*. teaches twenty-two boys.

At Manchester, £2,608. 3*s*. 11*d*. teaches eighty boys.

Mr. Mann bitterly complains of the character of the text-books introduced into the common schools of England, and considers the impossibility of obtaining by any other means a thorough revision of these, as one of the most serious evils attending the absence of a National System. We know well that many of these text-books are as bad and as stupid as they well can be: but we confess we have no experience of such books to which the following description could with any justice be applied:—

"In some of the book-shops in England I saw text-books for schools, on no single page of which should a child ever be allowed to look,—books for the young, filled with vile caricatures and low ribaldry, at once degrading to the taste and fatal to the moral sensibilities."—p. 45.

In contrast with the evils of neglect and irresponsible provision for such purposes as witnessed in England, we find this lively acknowledgment of the blessings and obligations which Massachusetts derives from the system of Public Instruction founded by the Fathers of the Commonwealth.

"We can never fully estimate the debt of gratitude we owe to our ancestors for establishing our system of Common Schools. In consequence of their wisdom and foresight, we have all grown up in the midst of these institutions; and we have been conformed to them in all our habits and associations from our earliest childhood. A feeling of strangeness, of the loss of something customary and valuable, would come over us, were they to be taken away or abolished. How different it would be if these institutions were strangers to us,—if every time we were called to do any thing in their behalf, we should violate a habit of thought and action instead of fulfilling one. How different, if every appropriation for their support were a new burden; if every meeting for their administration were an unaccustomed tax upon our time, and we were obliged to await the slow progress of an idea in the common mind, for the adoption of any improvement. Emphatically how different, if the wealthy and

leading men of the community had gathered themselves into sects and cabals, each one with his hand against all the rest, unless when they should temporarily unite to resist the establishment of a system for the equal benefit of all. It is in consequence of what was done for us, two hundred years ago, that we are now carrying on a work with comparative ease, which in many of our sister States, as well as in some foreign countries, must be accomplished, if accomplished at all, with great labour and difficulty. Can there be a man amongst us so recreant to duty, that he does not think it incumbent upon him to transmit that system, in an improved condition, to posterity, which his ancestors originated for him?"

Mr. Mann reports that with the exception of the magnificent private establishments in England and France, he has scarcely seen a school-house in Europe worthy to be compared even with the second-rate class of Massachusetts; and that even these princely exceptions are far inferior in fittings-up and internal arrangements. In attention to the laws of health and life he reports the same inferiority, though before leaving Massachusetts he had supposed that in no part of the civilized world were those laws so much neglected. He gives some amusing instances of the absurd practices of Germany in these respects. The boys are perched on stools so high that their feet cannot touch the ground,—whilst the rooms are so low that their heads nearly reach the ceiling. At night each child is supplied with two feather beds, "one for himself to lie on, the other to lie on him." And with the teachers and assistants, the feather beds increase in proportion to their dignity. Mr. Mann thinks that much of German phlegm and inertia are attributable to the circumstance, that "every respectable man and child sleeps between two feather beds, summer and winter."

When speaking of school apparatus, Mr. Mann mentions an excellent practice which prevails in Holland alone,—that of having in the school the weights and measures of the country, so that a ready and accurate knowledge is obtained of them by familiar handling and use. This is a very different matter from learning dry measures, from *dry* tables in a book. He very pertinently observes, that not many men could name the weights and measures of their own country, if actually set before them. The tables learned by rote have vanished from the mind,—and the ideas never were in it. Also in Holland large cards are hung upon the walls of the school-rooms, containing *fac similes* of all the current coins of the kingdom. The gold, silver, and copper coins are represented in their respective colours.

Another peculiarity in the fitting-up of the school rooms, in Holland and Germany, is the adorning of the walls with the portraits of distinguished men. How true is the following re-

mark in relation to England,—though we do not know that our national preference of glory to goodness is made conspicuous in our charity schools.

"Almost without exception, they were likenesses of good men rather than of great ones,—frequently of distinguished educationists and benefactors of the young, whose countenances were radiant with the light of benevolence, and the very sight of which was a moral lesson to the susceptible hearts of children. In this respect, they contrasted most strongly with England, where the great always takes precedence of the good, and there are fifty monuments and memorials for Nelson and Wellington, to one for Howard or Wilberforce."

Mr. Mann reports very unfavourably of the Monitorial system, and thinks the emphasis of the name should be in a perpetual *admonition* to have nothing to do with the system. He says very justly, that "one must see the difference between the pampering, blinding, misleading instruction given by an inexperienced child, and the developing, transforming, and almost creative power of an accomplished teacher;—one must rise to some comprehension of the vast import and significance of the phrase 'to educate'—before he can regard with a sufficiently energetic contempt that boast of Dr. Bell, 'Give me twenty-four pupils to-day, and I will give you back twenty-four teachers to-morrow.'"

The palm is given in this report to the Scotch Schools for the mental activity with which the exercises are conducted, both on the part of the teachers and pupils. The Schools in the United States are described as dormitories when compared with the fervid life of the Scotch Schools. About six times as many questions were put, and answers given, as our Author, in the same space of time, ever heard put and given in any school of his own country. He gives a very animated picture of the intellectual excitement kept up by an examination conducted with electrical rapidity, and with every goad to emulation. He states that he never saw a teacher in Scotland *sitting* in a school-room.

"To an unaccustomed spectator, on entering one of these rooms, all seems uproar, turbulence and the contention of angry voices,—the teacher traversing the space before his class, in a state of high excitement, the pupils springing from their seats, darting to the middle of the floor, and sometimes, with extended arms, forming a circle around him, two, three, or four deep,—every finger quivering from the intensity of their emotions,—until some more sagacious mind, outstripping its rivals, solves the difficulty,—when all are in their seats again, as though by magic, and ready for another encounter of wits.

"I have seen a school kept for two hours in succession, in this state of intense mental activity, with nothing more than an alternation of subjects during the time, or perhaps the relaxation of singing. At the end of the recitation, both teacher and pupils would glow with heat, and be covered with perspiration, as though they had been contending in the race or the ring. It would be utterly impossible for the children to bear such fiery excitement, if the physical exercise were not as violent as the mental is intense. But children who actually leap into the air from the energy of their impulses, and repeat this as often as once in two minutes, on an average, will not suffer from suppressed activity of the muscular system."

Of English Schools Mr. Mann says nothing, for, though he admits some of them to be good, they do not differ from the common specimens of good schools in his own country. He mentions, however, an answer he received from the Head Master of a school of a thousand children in London, when asked what moral education or training he gave to his scholars,—what he did, for instance, when he detected a child in a lie:—

"His answer was literally this:—'I consider all moral education to be a humbug. Nature teaches children to lie. If one of my boys lies, I set him to write some such copy as this—"Lying is a base and infamous offence;"—I make him write a quire of paper over with this copy, and he knows very well that if he does not bring it to me in a good condition, he will get a flogging.' On hearing this reply, I felt as if the number of things, in surrounding society, which needed explanation, was considerably reduced!"

Some very interesting accounts are given of Orphan Houses, or 'Redemption Institutes,' in the various States of Germany, and of the noble and devoted men who preside over them. It is delightful to hear of such men as Wichern and Von Türk, at Hamburgh and Potsdam,—the one pursuing successfully a plan formed in his youth for the reformation of juvenile criminals through a discipline of steady industry and domestic affection, —and the other resigning the judgment-seat where the sentence of condemnation was but the necessary consequence of early neglect, to become the friend and instructor of orphan children.

The superiority of the Prussian Schools is mainly attributed to the proper Classification of the Scholars. Wherever it is practicable the children are distributed according to their age and attainment, and consigned to a single teacher in a separate apartment. In this way the undivided attention and interest of his mind are given to a single class,—and he is preserved from the weariness and distraction attending the ineffectual attempt to keep a whole School employed in twenty different occupa-

tions in the same Room. The teacher also, under this system, can be the companion of his pupils in their exercises and sports, and when he conducts them to the playground leaves none behind him in the school-room, to idle or work mischief when released from inspection.

The Prussian and Saxon Schools are all substantially conducted in the same manner. Mr. Mann describes the method of teaching the younger children, as he witnessed it in a visit to a class-room of sixty children, of about six years of age. They had been but a few weeks at school. The Teacher, first engaging and fixing the attention of his class, uttered a prayer consisting of a single sentence, asking that as they had come together to learn, they might be good and diligent. He then spoke to them of the day, of the seasons, of the different kinds of fruit-trees in bearing, of the uses of trees in constructing houses, furniture, &c. During this familiar conversation of about twenty minutes the teacher's manner was dignified though playful, and whilst constantly throwing out remarks that enlivened the whole school, there was never the slightest symptom of disorder.

Every child had a slate and pencil, and a little reading-book of letters, words, and short sentences. The teacher drew a house upon the black board,—every Prussian teacher being more or less accomplished in the art of drawing. By the side of, and under, the drawing he wrote the word *house* in the German written character, and printed it in the German letter. With a long pointing-rod he ran over the forms of the letters,—the children looking at the pointing-rod and tracing the forms of the letters in the *air*. The next process was to copy the word 'house' both in the written and printed character on their slates. Then came the formation of the sounds of the letters composing the word. Here the *names* of the letters were not given, but their *powers*, or sounds in combination. The letter *h* was first taken, and the children instead of articulating *aitch*, gave a hard breathing,—such a sound as the letter really has in the word 'house.' Then the diphthong *au* (of the German word 'haus') was taken and sounded in the same way: the blocks containing *h* and *au* were now brought together, and the sounds combined. Lastly the letter *s* was first sounded by itself, then added to the others,—and afterwards the whole word was spoken.

When the word was completely impressed on their minds, the teacher drew the pointing-rod over the lines in the drawing of the house,—whilst the children imitated, first in the *air*, and afterwards on the slates. Then followed a lively conversation

on the different kinds of houses,—the materials of which they are made, and the various artificers employed.

Mr. Mann remarks as a peculiarity of these schools, and, though somewhat a tax on time, we think a valuable one, that every *answer* is required to be a distinct sentence in itself, without requiring the words of the question to complete the sense. In this way children are taught from the first to form sentences with accuracy and propriety,—and the information contained in the answer and question is more distinctly conceived.

Here in this single lesson of an hour were the elements of reading, spelling, writing, grammar, and drawing, mingled with much lively conversation and general information,—and when the hour had expired, not a child in the room seemed to know or think that his play-time had come. With this living instruction, compare the old method of calling up a child, and when a teacher, with a book or card in his hand, says *a*, the child echoes *a*; and the teacher says *b*, and the child echoes *b*, and so on till the child is released to sit still and look at vacancy. It is stated that the 'Names of the Letters,' or the Alphabet, have ceased to be taught as a preliminary exercise to reading for the last twenty years by every teacher in Prussia.

A brief account is next given of the lesson of a more advanced class. The subject was a short piece of poetry describing a hunter's life in Missouri. It was first read, with great attention on the part of the teacher to tone and pronunciation. The teacher entered into a minute explanation of every part, accompanied with questions relating to every point that might be foreign or unfamiliar to a German child, and then required a written account of the sentiment and story as the exercise for the next morning. In a class still more advanced, a poem of Schiller, a sort of philosophical allegory, was the lesson. When it was completed, one of the pupils was required to give a popular exposition of its meaning. The lad stepped to the teacher's desk, and standing in front of the school, occupied about fifteen minutes in an extemporaneous account of the poem.

The Arithmetical and Mathematical lessons are given in the same lively and practical manner. Numbers were taught with a constant reference to magnitudes. Thus in teaching the numbers from one to ten, blocks of one cube, two cubes, three cubes, &c., were employed, and *names* were constantly associated with sensible representations of quantity and size,—and even the first steps in the mensuration of superficies and solids insensibly taken. The arbitrary division of Arithmetic into rules, which

prevails so much with us, is not followed, but the most varied exercises deduced from the same elementary principles.

The hand-writing in the Prussian schools is remarkable for its excellence. Yet Mr. Mann observes that he never saw so great a proportion of cases in any school where the pen was so awkwardly held, and attributes the wonderful beauty of the writing to the universal practice of learning to draw contemporaneously with learning to write. To begin the use of the pencil or the pen with inexpressive marks, or unmeaning letters, is similar in its lifelessness to an introduction to knowledge through the names of the letters. Our author declares, that at last he could always tell by a mere inspection of the copy-books of the pupils whether drawing was taught in the school,—and records a saying of Pestalozzi, that 'without drawing there can be no writing.' The advantages possessed by a teacher capable of rapid and correct drawing, in every department of instruction, can hardly be overstated,—whilst for the pupil, it is the very best education of the powers of description, the sense of beauty, and the habit of just and accurate observation. There is no instrument of instruction in which the Elementary Schools of England are more lamentably deficient. The importance of this art, however, is now generally recognized; our school-rooms are, for the most part, furnished with drawings of various objects of Natural History, and the chief obstacle to its constant use as one of the instruments for imparting clear and vivid ideas, is the incompetence of our teachers. It is to be hoped that Mechanics' Institutions will gradually remove this disqualification.

In teaching Geography correct ideas of position and space were derived first from familiar scenes,—the school-house with the grounds attached to it,—the home with its yards and gardens. It is stated that Ritter of Berlin, the most celebrated of living geographers, expressed a decided opinion, that this was the true mode of beginning.

Geography was taught principally by delineations on the black-board,—and here the skill in drawing of teacher and pupil was employed with admirable service. One of these lessons is described. The teacher after looking his class into eager readiness, made on the board a series of those lines and shadings employed by map-engravers to represent a chain of mountains. Scarcely had the outlines become visible when the scholars began to cry out, Carpathian Mountains, Hungary; Black Forest Mountains, Wurtenburgh, &c. But the remainder of this animated scene we must transcribe:—

"In less than half a minute the ridge of that grand central elevation which separates the waters that flow North-west into the German ocean,

from those that flow North into the Baltic, and South-east into the Black Sea, was presented to view,—executed almost as beautifully as an engraving. A dozen strokes made in the twinkling of an eye represented the head-waters of the great rivers which flow in different directions from that mountainous range; while the children almost as eager and excited as though they had actually seen the torrents dashing down the mountain sides, cried out, Danube, Elbe, Vistula, Oder, &c. The next moment I heard a succession of smaller strokes or taps, so rapid as to be almost indistinguishable, and hardly had my eye time to discern a large number of dots made along the margins of the rivers, when the shout of Lintz, Vienna, Prague, Dresden, Berlin, &c., struck my ear. At this point in the exercise, the spot which had been occupied on the black-board was nearly a circle, of which the starting point, or place where the teacher first began, was the centre; but now a few additional strokes around the circumference of the incipient Continent, extended the mountain ranges outwards towards the plains,—the children responding the names of the countries in which they respectively laid. With a few more flourishes, the rivers flowed onwards towards their several terminations, and by another succession of dots, new cities sprang up along their banks. By this time the children had become as much excited as though they had been present at a world making. They rose in their seats, they flung out both hands, their eyes kindled, and their voices became almost vociferous as they cried out the names of the different places, which under the magic of the teacher's crayon rose into view. Within ten minutes from the commencement of the lesson, there stood upon the black-board a beautiful map of Germany, with its mountains, principal rivers and cities, the coast of the German Ocean, the Baltic and the Black Seas; and all so accurately proportioned that I think only slight errors would have been found had it been subjected to the test of a scale of miles.——

"Compare the effects of such a lesson as this, both as to the amount of the knowledge communicated, and the vividness and of course the permanence of the ideas obtained, with a lesson where the scholars look out a few names of places on a lifeless atlas, but never send their imaginations abroad over the earth; and the teacher sits listlessly down before them to interrogate them from a book, in which all the questions are printed at full length, to supersede on his part all necessity of knowledge."

'Exercises in Thinking' form a regular part of school business in Germany. When every lesson is an exercise in thinking, it is not easy to perceive why there should be a separate department of instruction with this name. It would appear that it is merely a heading under which are comprehended lessons on subjects of general knowledge that do not admit of being classified under the common branches of school-instruction,—and in which it is a principal object to elicit mental activity in the pupils. Mr. Mann relates that when visiting the schools in Leipsic he observed to the superintendent, Dr. Vogel, that he did not see on the 'Study-Plan' of his schools, the title, 'Ex-

ercises in Thinking;'—he received this remarkable reply: 'No,—for I think it a *sin* in any teacher not to lead his pupils to think, in regard to all the subjects he teaches.'—"He did not call it an omission, or even a disqualification in a teacher, if he did not awaken thoughts in the minds of his pupils, but he peremptorily denounced it as a '*sin.*' Alas! thought I, what expiation will be sufficient for many of us who have had charge of the young!"

The Bible commands especial attention in the Prussian schools. In mixed schools the general religious instruction is chiefly of an historical nature. In the Protestant Schools Luther's Catechism is taught, and in the Roman Catholic the Catechism of that Church. In the mixed schools there is combined literary, and separate religious education, when the doctrines of the several denominations are assiduously inculcated.

All Prussian teachers are required to be more or less masters of vocal and instrumental music. The violin is as sure to be seen in the school-room as the black-board. When Wichern was asked by what means he produced such transforming effects on the children under his charge, he replied, 'By active occupations, *music*, and Christian love.' Generally speaking the teachers played also upon the organ and piano, and employed music, not only as an accomplishment and recreation, but as a moral instrument of great and peculiar efficacy.

All these various departments of knowledge and accomplishment are taught in the lowest schools, whether of town or country; in the pauper establishments; and in the schools attached to the prisons and houses of correction. In all these, "there was a teacher of *mature age*, of simple, unaffected, and decorous manners, benevolent in his expression, kind and genial in his intercourse with the young, and of such attainments and resources as qualified him not only to lay down the abstract principles of the above range of studies, but by familiar illustration and apposite example, to commend them to the attention of the children."

Such an order of men could not, of course, be supplied without Seminaries for Teachers. The usual term of residence at these seminaries is three years. In that time a talented and earnest young man will acquire such a general preparation as will qualify him for the particular and daily preparation, which a Prussian teacher never fails to make before meeting his class. In some places there are even preliminary institutions where pupils are received, in order to determine whether they are fit to become candidates for admission into the seminaries for Teachers. Even after the three years course of study, a pupil of the seminary is liable to be set aside, should it appear that he

is not likely to become an efficient teacher. In one of the preliminary schools, the subjects of an examination, at which Mr. Mann attended, were divided into two classes:—1. Readiness in Thinking, German Language, including Orthography and Composition, History, Description of the Earth, Knowledge of Nature, Thorough Bass, Calligraphy, Drawing. 2. Religion, Knowledge of the Bible, Mental Arithmetic, Singing, Violin Playing, and readiness in speaking. The examination in the first division of subjects was conducted in writing, and in the second orally. After two entire days occupied in examination, out of a class of thirty, nine were rejected as inadmissible to the seminary schools, that is, were considered ineligible to have an opportunity of *becoming eligible*, as teachers, after three years further study. What shall we say in this country of such a preparation? Yet nothing is wanting but a National System of Education, now unhappily more hopelessly remote than ever, to command an immediate approach to it. Without something of a National System, we have not the means of calling it into existence, or of enforcing, a standard of qualification in our existing schools.

Connected with all the seminaries for teachers are large Model or Experimental Schools. Much of the students' time is spent in these schools, in the latter part of their course. At first they are silent listeners while an accomplished teacher instructs a class. Then they commence teaching under the eye of such an instructer, and finally they are left alone with a class, being responsible for its proficiency and order, at the end of a week, or some fixed period. During the whole course Lectures are delivered on the theory and practice of teaching, and the essential qualifications for the office:—the spirit of devotion and religious fidelity,—the motives to be applied to the minds of children,—a study of the different natural dispositions,—the sense of occupying for a time the parental relation towards them, are made the very atmosphere in which the candidate spends his probationary years.

With men so trained, and with such views of their calling, Education becomes a peculiar power, in the exercise of which they take delight. Mr. Mann states three remarkable facts respecting the Schools of Prussia and Saxony:—

1. "I never saw a teacher hearing a lesson of any kind (excepting a reading or spelling lesson), *with a book in his hand.*

2. "I never saw a teacher *sitting*, while hearing a recitation.

3. "Though I saw hundreds of schools, and thousands,—I think I may say, within bounds, tens of thousands of pupils,—*I never saw one*

child undergoing punishment, or arraigned for misconduct. I never saw one child in tears from having been punished, or from fear of being punished."

Nothing but the power of constantly interesting and occupying the mind could produce such results. In our own country, how often is it the case, that instead of ruling by an intellectual fascination, the incompetent teacher has no other way to command order than to "make desolation of all the active and playful impulses of childhood and call it peace." The following statement is to us perfectly delightful:—

"When a difficult question has been put to a child, which tasks all his energies, the teacher approaches him with a mingled look of concern and encouragement; he stands before him, the light and shade of hope and fear alternately crossing his countenance; he lifts his arms and turns his body,—as a bowler who has given a wrong direction to his bowl will writhe his person to bring the ball back upon its track;—and finally if the little wrestler with difficulty triumphs, the teacher felicitates him upon his success, perhaps seizes and shakes him by the hand, in token of congratulation; and when the difficulty has been really formidable, and the effort triumphant, I have seen the teacher catch up the child in his arms and embrace him, as though he were not able to contain his joy. At another time, I have seen a teacher actually clap his hands with delight at a bright reply; and all this has been done so naturally and so unaffectedly as to excite no other feeling in the residue of the children than a desire, by the same means, to win the same caresses. What person worthy of being called by the name, or of sustaining the sacred relations of a parent, would not give any thing, bear any thing, sacrifice any thing, to have his children, during eight or ten years of the period of their childhood, surrounded by circumstances, and breathed upon by sweet and humanizing influences, like these?"

The Schools of Prussia are kept in this high state of efficiency by its system of School Inspectors. The whole Kingdom is divided into School Districts, and to each of these there is assigned a Commissioner or Inspector. These Mr. Mann describes to be such men as would in America be presidents or professors of colleges, judges of the higher courts, or in other civil stations requiring first-rate talent and attainment. The influence exerted by such officers in elevating the standard of qualification among teachers, and in preventing any retrograde movement, must be an essential part of the Prussian System. Over all these intermediate functionaries presides the Minister of Public Instruction, who is a member of the King's Council, and takes rank with the highest officers of the Government.

At a fixed age every child in Prussia is said to be *due to the School*, and no excuse but sickness is admitted. If a child is not sent immediately on his attaining the legal age, or if he

absents himself after enrolment, a notice is served upon the parents. If the child does not appear, a summons follows. If the parent has no excuse, and refuses compliance, "the child is taken from him and sent to school, the father to prison." Mr. Mann gives some of the forms of these legal notices and summonses.

Notice from the teacher to the parent.

"We miss —— from the class, since ——, without having received any intimation of the reasons of his absence. We request you therefore to endorse the cause of absence on this ticket, and to send your child to school again."

If a valid excuse is not given, the School-Director reports the case to the School-Inspector, who cites the parent before a Magistrate, by the following form of warrant, which is served by a police officer:—

"You are hereby called to appear on ——, at ——, to be tried for the neglected school attendance of your child."

Parents, however, are not obliged to send their children to the *public* school. They are at liberty to make choice of a *private* one: but all teachers, whether public or private, must submit to examination, and obtain a certificate of qualification from the government officer. In this respect the Prussian system is less rigorous and despotic than that attempted to be introduced into this country by her Majesty's present Government in relation to Factory children. That gave to the parent no choice, and compelled attendance on the Factory school, however inferior it might be to some private school, for the advantage of which to his child he might be willing to make any sacrifice, or however disagreeable it might be to him on other accounts, reasonable or unreasonable.

Mr. Mann states that such is the attachment of the children to the school, and the appreciation on the part of the parents of the benefits received, and so entirely has the public sentiment become conformed to the practice, that the compulsory attendance is never made matter of complaint, except in the cases where a difficulty arises from the enforcement of a religious creed. It is not true that this compulsory attendance is found in connection with despotism alone. In Saxony and many of the free states, the regulations on this subject, proceeding from constitutional governments, are as stringent as those of Prussia. We confess that it appears to us one of the highest duties of a Government to see that every child of the state is educated, and not liable to become a bad subject through

the grossest ignorance and neglect: and whilst we would allow all liberty to parents to provide this education for their children in such way as proceeds most directly from their own parental affection and sense of responsibility, we cannot admit the right of the parent to injure the child, or that there is any violation of natural privileges when the state declares its determination to save the child from ignorance and future ruin, in all cases in which the parent fails to manifest a parent's sentiment, and to discharge a parent's duty. It would be degrading to constituted society, if it had only the power to punish, but no right to anticipate and prevent the evils which lead to punishment. We believe, however, that compulsory attendance would never come in question, if the school provision existed, and the mere *circumstances* which are necessary to create a national sentiment of the benefits of Instruction.

Mr. Mann discusses the question, why it is that with such a machinery for public instruction the Prussians do not rise more rapidly in the scale of civilized nations,—why are the mechanical arts so imperfect among them, and why are their general characters so sluggish and unenterprizing. He refers the absence of the practical results that might be expected from their system of Education chiefly to the following causes:—

First. That the children are taken from the *People's* schools at too early an age. At fourteen, when the mind first begins to work upon the ideas it receives, the child is withdrawn from instruction.

Secondly. That Germany is remarkably deficient in the class of books suitable for older children or younger men. This is a circumstance which, considering the prolific nature of the German mind, requires itself to be accounted for. The Prussian too has no Newspaper corresponding to that popular instrument of intelligence and general knowledge in England or America.

Thirdly. That the Prussians are not citizens, but only subjects of a state. Mr. Mann strikingly observes that our common phrases, 'the active duties of life,' 'the responsibilities of citizenship,' 'the career of action,' 'the obligations to posterity,' would be strange sounding words in a Prussian ear. The Prussian has no municipal or civil life. He has nothing to do with the laws but to obey them; nor with taxes but to pay them. Even the laying of a road, or the building of a bridge, are matters which are not submitted to him. His sovereign, his taxation, his religion, are all settled for him. Now, says our author, "although there is a sleeping ocean in the bosom of every child that is born into the world, yet if no

freshening, life-giving breeze ever sweeps across its surface, why should it not repose in dark stagnation for ever?"

Mr. Mann states that a remarkable proverb has obtained currency in Prussia: THE SCHOOL IS GOOD, THE WORLD IS BAD. The activity generated by the one, dies of disuse in the other. Still the expansive force of knowledge and justice cannot altogether be subdued, and it is impossible to doubt that the time is coming when the people must assert their rights, and demand an outward life in harmony with their ideas. The late King promised a constitution to his people, lived twenty-five years afterwards, "and died forsworn." It is said that suspicions are entertained that the present sovereign is not favourable to the great intellectual movement which is not only preparing his people for self-government, but making it certain that they will one day demand it.

The section on 'Corporal Punishment' is chiefly remarkable for the gratifying testimony that on the Continent it is almost entirely obsolete—and that in Great Britain it is fast becoming so. With regard to solitary confinement, however, as a punishment in schools, he mentions circumstances which we do not know how to believe, but of which he affirms he had personal knowledge.

> "In large establishments at Birmingham, Liverpool, &c., I saw cells, or solitary chambers, four or five feet square, for the imprisonment of offenders."

We should be glad to be informed where it is in *Liverpool*, that "not mere children, but young men," "lads fifteen or sixteen years of age, dressed in cap and gown," are immured in cells four feet square, that is, in holes less than the dimensions of the small table at which we write. Mr. Mann is a credible witness, and the matter challenges inquiry.

Much useful information is communicated respecting the modes of conveying moral and religious instruction in the various Schools of Europe, but especially of England and Scotland. In some countries, as in Holland, all doctrinal religious instruction is excluded from the schools. The Bible is not read in them, and though the children are permitted to withdraw at a fixed hour, for the purpose of receiving a religious lesson from their pastors, they are not required so to do. In England there is neither law nor system on this or any other matter connected with popular Education, and, except in the schools of the Church of England, every variety of practice prevails. Mr. Mann gives several examples of the miserable

manner in which such instruction is given in the schools of Great Britain.

In a school of high standing near London, he expressed a desire to hear the teacher communicate information on the social virtues, such as regard to truth, observance of the rights of property, &c. The teacher turned to his class, and asked, "What instances of lying are given in the Bible?—*A.* The case of Ananias and Sapphira. *Q.* Against whom was that crime committed?—*A.* Against the Holy Ghost. *Q.* What doctrine of the Bible does this prove?—*A.* The doctrine of the Trinity. Here he stopped as though the subject of lying were exhausted."

He mentions the case of a school in Edinburgh, in which he no sooner read any portion of any verse in the Gospels and Epistle to the Hebrews, than the pupils announced the book, the chapter, and the number of the verse,—but in which the only answer he could obtain to the question, 'What is honesty,' was, 'To give money to the poor,'—a definition, he adds, to which the whole class assented.

In Prussia only two systems of religion prevail, the Protestant Evangelical and the Catholic. In the cases where the children all belong to one religious denomination, the teacher gives the religious instruction. Mr. Mann states that in the schools, gymnasia, and universities of Prussia, a large proportion of the teachers are inwardly opposed to the doctrines they are required to teach. On asking one of these how he could teach what he disbelieved, and whether to do so was not of the essence of falsehood, he was told, "It is a lie of necessity. The Government compel us to do this, or it takes away our bread." On another occasion a school-inspector of great intelligence expressed the opinion that it would be impossible for any government to stand which did not select some form of religion to be enforced through the school and the pulpit on the whole community,—and it afterwards appeared that this man was a pantheist, and a disbeliever in the Book whose use and whose Doctrines, as interpreted by the State, he was enjoining upon all the schools of his charge.

The conclusion of this Report is remarkably eloquent. The picture of America's privileged condition, by her origin, and her distance from the social evils, and established sources of evil that oppress other lands, and of her consequent obligations, is a very striking piece of writing. We must close our extracts with a passage that is intended to describe the present condition and prospects of the great masses of this country. It is largely and fearfully true.

"No truth can be more certain than this,—that after the poor, the ignorant, the vicious, have fallen below a certain point of degradation, they become an increasing fund of pauperism and vice,—a pauper-engendering hive, a vital, self-enlarging, reproductive mass of ignorance and crime. And thus, from parent to child, the race may go on, degenerating in body and soul, and casting off, one after another, the lineaments and properties of humanity, until the human fades away and is lost in the brutal or demoniac nature. While the vicious have pecuniary means, they have a choice of vices in which they can indulge; but though stripped of means to the last farthing, their ability to be vicious, and all the fatal consequences to society of that viciousness, still remain. Nay, it is then that their vices become most virulent and fatal. However houseless or homeless, however diseased or beggarly, a wretch who is governed only by his instincts may be, marriage is still open to him; or, so far as the condition and character of the next generation are concerned, the same consequences may happen without marriage. This also the statesman and the moralist should heed, that however adverse to the welfare of human society may be the circumstances under which a foredoomed class of children are born, yet the doctrine of the sanctity of human life protects their existence. Public hospitals, private charities, step in and rescue them from the hand of death. Hence they swarm into life by myriads, and crowd upwards into the ranks of society. But in society there are no vacant places to receive them, nor unclaimed bread for their sustenance. Though uninstructed in the arts of industry, though wholly untaught in the restraints and obligations of duty, still the great primal law of self-preservation works in their blood as vigorously as in the blood of kings. It urges them on to procure the means of gratification; but, having no resources in labour or in frugality, they betake themselves to fraud, violence, incendiarism, and the destruction of human life, as naturally as an honest man engages in an honest employment. Such, literally, is the present condition of large portions of the human race in some countries of Europe. In wide rural districts,—in moral jungles, hidden from public view within the recesses of great cities, those who are next to be born, and to come upon the stage of action, will come, *fifty to one*, from the lowest orders of the people,—lowest in intellect and morals, and in the qualities of prudence, foresight, judgment, temperance; lowest in health and vigour, and in all the elements of a good mental and physical organization;—strong only in the fierce strength of the animal nature, and in the absence of all reason and conscience to restrain its ferocity. Of such stock and lineage must the next generation be. In the mean time, while these calamities are developing and maturing, a few individuals,—some of whom have a deep stake in society, others moved by nobler considerations of benevolence and religion,—are striving to discover or devise the means for warding off these impending dangers. Some look for relief in a change of administration, and in the change of policy it will insure. With others, compulsory emigration is a remedy,—a remedy by which a portion of the household is to be expelled from the paternal mansion by the terrors of starvation. There are still others who think that the redundant population should be reduced to the

existing means of subsistence; and they hint darkly at pestilence and famine, as agents for sweeping away the surplus poor,—as famishing sailors upon a wreck hint darkly at the casting of lots. Smaller in numbers than any of the preceding, is that class who see and know that, while the prolific causes of these evils are suffered to exist, all the above schemes, though executed to their fullest extent, can only be palliatives of the pain, and not remedies for the disease;—who see and know how fallacious and nugatory all such measures must be towards the laying anew of the social foundations of strength and purity. They see and know that no external appliances can restore soundness to a fabric, where the dry rot of corruption has penetrated to the innermost fibres of its structure. The only remedy,—this side of miracles,—which presents itself to the clear vision of this class, is in a laborious process of renovation, in a thorough physical, mental, spiritual culture of the rising generation, reaching to its depths, extending to its circumference, sustained by the power and resources of the government, and carried forward irrespective of party and of denomination. But a combination of vested interests has hitherto cut off this resource, and hence they stand, appalled and aghast, like one who finds too late that he is in the path of the descending avalanche. Under circumstances so adverse to the well-being of large portions of the race, the best that even hope dares to whisper, is, that in the course of long periods yet to come, the degraded progeny of a degraded parentage may at length be reclaimed, may be uplifted to the level whence their fearful descent began. But if this restoration is ever effected, it can only be by such almost superhuman exertions as will overcome the momentum they have acquired in the fall, and by vast expenditures and sacrifices corresponding to the derelictions of former times."

ART. II.—MENTAL HYGIENE: Or an Examination of the Intellect and Passions, designed to illustrate their influence on Health and the Duration of Life. By WILLIAM SWEETSER, M.D. (Reprinted from the American Edition.) Edinburgh: 1844.

WE cannot call this a scientific work. It is hardly even a digest of practical observations. It contains the sensible remarks of a medical man whose attention has been drawn to a most important subject, arranged under convenient heads, and illustrated with such anecdotes and authorities as his reading happened to afford. It presents some useful materials, and offers some good advice, but has small pretensions to be an 'Examination' of a subject so extensive and refined. An amusing and practically useful, if not a very instructive, Article might be furnished, by culling from its facts and stories. The author commences with stating the conduciveness to health of mental activity, and combats the prejudice, which we cannot say ever happened to come across us, that intellectual pursuits are prosecuted at the expense of life. No doubt this is the tendency of excessive exercise of the brain,—but we thought it was universally conceded that some use of the mind was the salt of the body. To remove this fear from aspiring youths, a list is given of the longevity of the brain-workers. Newton lived to eighty-five; an unsatisfactory example however, for all that distinguishes him was executed in very early life. Galileo died at seventy-eight; Locke at seventy-three; Franklin at eighty-five. "By living twelve years," says the latter, "beyond David's period, I seem to have intruded myself into the company of posterity, when I ought to have been a-bed and asleep. Yet had I gone at seventy, it would have cut off twelve of the most active years of my life, employed too in matters of the greatest importance." The author somewhat fancifully and freely cites the Peripatetics and Academics as examples of the higher regard paid by the ancients to physical Education,—as though they had selected their methods of lecturing for the benefit of their health, and, as it would appear, differed on the subject.

The diseases to which literary men are subject, from intellectual excess, are said to be chiefly apoplexy, epilepsy, inflammation of the brain, and dyspepsia. This is a formidable list, but the author very candidly admits that they are likely to result not so much from studious habits, as from a combination of these with injudicious and luxurious living,—from the desire

at the same time to task the mind and indulge the stomach, to read like Petrarch, and eat like an alderman. There is some excellent advice to studious men, if they can only take it, to laugh and play with their families; to despise not the lower pleasure of social meals; to be "long and sound sleepers;" to give four hours a-day to bodily exertions; and to make choice of large and airy rooms. How much does all this take for granted! Nevertheless every one may do well to follow as much of these directions as he can. The poor student who cannot, will be the last to grudge his exemption from toil, trouble, anxious meals, and suffocation, to his more privileged brother. From seven to eight hours is said to be the utmost that can profitably be given in one day to close mental application: and it is perhaps truly, though ambiguously, remarked, that "there is scarcely any book which does not savour of painful composition in some part of it; because the author has written when he should have rested."

The injurious effects on health of intellectual operations are chiefly in connection with those studies in which the passions of the mind are deeply moved, or moral sensibility is elicited. Much curious and useful knowledge would be derived from an accurate statistical account of the comparative longevity of the various professions. The Natural Philosophers are said to be the longest livers; the poets the shortest. We once saw an American table assigning a long life to controversial Preachers, but cutting short the days of those who worked as Pastors, and came into constant collision with moral anxieties, and spiritual perplexities. We have no doubt that this is true, and that Priests and Dogmatists have very easy lives, with as little friction from the sword on the scabbard as can well be.

There can be no doubt that close and severe exercise of the intellect, in early years, lays the foundation both of bodily infirmity, and of mental decrepitude. The child's natural educator is the external world, with the interest and observation that can be excited by an intelligent friend or parent. Physical action is a necessity of all young natures; and one of the most valuable parts of Education, that of the Senses, might then be conducted to a degree of perfection, which at present they scarcely ever attain, and the loss of which is often the most serious injury the Intellect can sustain, from the absence of accurately noticed, and vividly conceived materials. The feebleness of the imagination, and the paucity of objects for the intellect to work upon, are mainly attributable to the defective service of the senses as the instruments of knowledge. The parents who by intellectual straining, in the words of Milton, 'wring blood from the nos-

trils' of childhood, speedily exhaust the tree from which they artificially force the fruit. It is clear that there is always something wrong in Education when it is not accompanied by both happiness and health. "Nature," says Rousseau, "intended that children should be children before they are men, and if we attempt to pervert this order, we shall produce early fruit, which will have neither maturity nor savour, and which soon spoils: we shall have young learned men and old children. Infancy has an order of seeing, thinking, and feeling, which is proper to it. Nothing is more foolish than to wish to make children substitute ours for theirs, and I would as soon require a child to be five feet high, as to display judgment at ten years of age." There is certainly an analogy between the infancy of the race and the childhood of an individual, and the arts which spontaneously appeared in the early ages of society, the harmony of sounds, music, painting, drawing, bodily exercises, and the perfect use of the senses, would seem the proper subjects for the primary instructions of children. Many are the points of similitude between childhood and old age; and the inability to bear severe mental exertion without injury to life, is as true of the octogenarian as of the child.

The proper exercise of the Passions has a still closer relation to health than the due exercise of the intellect. If all the strong emotions are Passions, they are essentially necessary to the noblest purposes and actions of men, and yet the most active sources of evil and misery, when separated from the quiet and unforced influences of conscience and reason.

The physical effects of passions of the mind are chiefly shown in the organic functions of the brain, the heart, and the stomach. It was once a common opinion with physiologists that the seat of the emotions is in the viscera of the chest and abdomen, so sudden and sensible is their influence in those regions. There is much of our common language framed upon this impression. The passions which affect certain states of the body are also themselves affected by those states, and it will require something more than the doctrine of the association of ideas to account for the fact, that the irritability which produces indigestion, is also itself produced by indigestion,—and that the mental anxiety which disorders the liver, is also itself generated by bilious conditions of the body. The waywardness of genius, when in connection with a frame whose want of robust strength permits it to become morbid, is largely owing to the intenser action of interior emotions, which in a moderate degree are common to all mankind. There is a large portion of what are often called imaginary sorrows proceeding from the diseased reciprocal

action of mind on body, which are among the most real things in the world, and are called imaginary only because it is not easy to lay the finger on their external causes. The worst result is, that from ignorance of the source of mischief, the remedy is often sought from the wrong agent. A man may be taxing himself with a bad heart when he is sluggish and selfish from the disorder of some secretive organs, the name of which he never heard of, and of whose existence, seat, and operation he is profoundly ignorant. "He," says Dr. Reid, "whose disposition to goodness can resist the influence of dyspepsia, and whose career of philanthropy is not liable to be checked by an obstruction in the hepatic organs, may boast of a much deeper and firmer virtue than falls to the ordinary lot of human nature."

It would appear that all the passions whose exercise is accompanied by, or consists in, pleasurable feelings, are productive of vital action. The blood bounds under their influence, and the countenance brightens with sentient health. So immediate indeed is the connection of these passions with states of health, that the excesses of joy have often proved fatal to life,—though in most cases the injury is to be attributed rather to the suddenness of the transition than to the absolute intensity of the emotion. Rapid and extreme alternations, whether in the mental or physical systems, are of all possible conditions the most abhorrent to nature. We have no doubt that the waving line, as the theory of beauty, owes whatever truth it contains, to the disinclination of our nature to all abrupt transitions, and that therefore harmony amidst variety is of the essence of the Beautiful.

The passions which are founded on pain, manifest themselves in a loss of vital action. The blood abandons the surface, and is thrown in undue quantities upon the internal organs, whence, as in certain states of anger, it is forcibly driven by violent reaction. The sighing of grief is but the effort of nature to discharge the heart and lungs of their unusual burden. And thus the buoyancy of joy, the expansion of pleasure, the inflation of pride,—and the oppression of grief, the shrinking of fear, the wasting of sorrow, are but the expression of physiological facts. The pleasurable passions universally quicken and diffuse life, whilst the painful ones contract and disturb it.

Several instances are given of the fatal effects of Anger, in its acute forms. The celebrated John Hunter, suffering under a disease of the heart, was in the habit of remarking, that 'his life was in the hands of any rascal who chose to annoy and tease him,'—and he is said to have died from the effects of an altercation with one of his colleagues. We lately heard of a

gentleman, in one of the midland counties, who died almost immediately after an angry interview with his washerwoman.

The chronic forms of Anger,—enmity, hatred, revenge,—are not less surely, though more slowly, injurious to health and life. It is well known to surgeons, that wounds will not heal kindly in a man of malevolent dispositions. One of the most common marks of insanity is the tendency to violent anger; and there can be no doubt that the indulged anger which the will might restrain may as certainly lead to insanity, as the diseased states of body which attend insanity are productive of irritability. The moral causes may produce the physical effects, with as much certainty as the physical influence disturbs the mind. Certain states of the affections, and certain influences of an easterly wind on the sea coast, may end in the same physical and mental irritability. It would be as absurd to apply the same treatment, as the same degree of blame, to these two cases.

Fear, for the most part, suppresses the action of the heart,—though where the case seems extreme, and despair is excited, a reaction may take place, and the most arrant coward, out of his very terror, perform the deeds of a hero. Fear and external chills produce the same effects on the courage and activity of the mind, and the phrase 'cold fear' is derived from physiological facts.

The influence of religious Fear in exciting convulsions and epilepses Dr. Sweetser illustrates by his own experience of the revivals and field-meetings annually held in some of the less densely inhabited districts of America. According to De Tocqueville there is a preparation in these cases for intense excitement in the long solitudes, and separation from the common traffic and intercourse of men, to which for a large part of the year so many of the settlers are subject. Our author declares, that on these occasions he has witnessed the most distressing spasms and contortions of the body, even in the most hardy and robust men. Dr. Prichard enumerates among the subjects of insanity, "those who frequent churches and chapels where the ministers are remarkable for a severe, impassioned, and almost imprecatory style of preaching, and for enforcing the terrors rather than setting forth the hopes and consolations which belong to the Christian religion." It is stated as a fact that the Society of Friends are exempt from religious insanity, because their Religion, being one of peace and charity, admits of no fanatical excitements. It is strange if this should prove true of a sect claiming individual inspiration, and we should have thought, peculiarly exposed to fanatical excitement. The exemption, if such there be, must result from a certain soundness

and sobriety in Quaker *discipline*, rather than from the nature of their tenets.

The influence of Fear in augmenting disease is so strong as considerably to diminish the chances of recovery in dangerous cases. It is said that small-pox is always most certain to commit its ravages on the beautiful who most dread its disfiguring effects: and in epidemics, those who live in most apprehension are most liable to be the victims. These facts would seem to establish the physiological doctrine that Fear is in every case accompanied with a loss of vital power. Such facts do something to expose the barbarous system of education from which we are only just escaping. Solomon's maxim has perhaps spoiled more happiness, and deranged the domestic affections more thoroughly, than any other piece of abused wisdom that could be cited. The natural affections are only recovering the sway and guidance against the coercive discipline which the supposed direction of an inspired man had made a religious duty. A sect appeared in America not long ago, one of whose distinguishing tenets was, that to whip children daily, with or without cause, was a religious obligation, and a saving discipline from which much spiritual benefit, and superiority to the flesh might reasonably be looked for. If any one finds it difficult to believe in the existence of such a religious monstrosity, we are prepared to furnish the evidence. In many respects the Education of the Greeks and Romans was of a more generous and manly kind, than that breaking of the spirit, and forced submission to artificial restraints which appear the essence of wisdom to those who regard the proper aim of religious training to be the extinction of Nature.

There is an indescribable fear which has obtained the name of Horror, from its convulsive effects on the bodily system. Its peculiarity is that it is not necessarily occasioned by objects capable of inflicting injury, and often arises from some unaccountable agitation of the nervous system. "I have seen persons," says Montaigne, "that have run faster from the smell of apples than from gun-shot; others that have been frightened at a mouse; that have vomited at the sight of cream; and some that have done the like at the making of a feather-bed." Such antipathies may depend on some unknown condition of the animal organization, or some painful association excited in early life when the sentient nature formed almost the whole of existence. "A great part of these," says Locke, "which are accounted natural would have been known to be from unheeded, though perhaps early, impressions, or wanton fancies at first, which would have been acknowledged the original of them, if

they had been warily observed." Too much care cannot be taken both to prevent the formation of these unnatural associations, and to strengthen that examining, healthy, and unfearing temper of mind which has power to throw them off. Morbid terrors are, for the most part, the results of accidental impressions on minds not habituated to a familiar intercourse with natural objects. Few naturalists, or natural philosophers, or physiologists, suffer much from such causes. Knowledge and experience, and educated common sense, will avail to overcome even the morbid tendencies of a nervous constitution. Nothing however can be more senseless and cruel than the rude forcing on the mind of the object of its horror.

The effect of GRIEF on the physical frame is perhaps the best known example of the bodily actions of the Passions. Every one has experienced the sudden cessation of appetite, the dryness and choking of the throat, the loading of the heart, more or less accompanying the degrees of affliction. Niobe turned into stone is but a mythological representation of the action of Grief in benumbing the powers of life. When grief breaks forth in lamentations and muscular writhings, it shows an energy of resistance in the system, and is sure to pass away. The only incurable grief is that which gives no sign, which bears the load upon the heart, and seeks no escape in sighing and complaint. The poets are the true historians of the passions, and Dr. Sweetser has aptly cited these lines of Spencer:—

> "What equall torment to the griefe of mind,
> And pyning anguish hid in gentle heart,
> That inly feeds itselfe with thoughts unkind,
> And nourisheth her owne consuming smart?
> What medicine can any leaches art
> Yeeld such a sore that doth her grievance hide,
> And will to none her maladie impart?"

They are not, however, the quick paroxysms of Grief, but certain low, creeping, and stubborn sorrows, which are most injurious to life and health. Laennec, a distinguished French writer on diseases of the chest, attributes the greater prevalence of consumption in large towns to the frequent occasions of gloom and depression. He states that all the individuals whom he had known to become consumptive without constitutional predisposition owed the origin of their malady to continued sorrow. In convents, where the diet and discipline could produce no such results, consumption is frequently generated by the state of the spirits. Insanity is in so many cases actively developed by

sorrow, that Pinel was in the habit of putting the question to every patient, who showed any remains of intelligence, "Have you undergone any vexation or disappointment?" and rarely received a negative answer. Our author states that the cancer in the stomach of which Napoleon died, never gave any tokens of its existence, though there might have been predisposition, until a year after he was subjected to the vexations of St. Helena.

In ancient times Suicide was often the termination of settled Grief, but rather because it was considered ignoble to live, than as an escape from mere misery. It is only in modern times that Suicide has been the refuge for anguish of mind. The ancients met a voluntary death with the calmness and dignity of a spirit that felt itself superior to the world, and departed not because there was no more of enjoyment to be looked for, but because life had become dishonoured in their eyes. Suicide was not a cowardly succumbing to suffering, but the proud resolve of a self-supporting mind, and brought not ignominy but glory. The spirit of Christianity has extinguished this false sentiment, and laid the essence of mental dignity in the patient and unyielding struggle with Evil. But as a necessary consequence of this improved sentiment, Suicide has become ignominious, except where directly referrible to insanity. One of the most remarkable circumstances in connection with the human mind is the well-authenticated fact, that Suicide may become an imitative act, and prevail like an epidemic. The only explanation that can be given is, that in weak and nervous subjects the imagination may become so haunted with the distinct conception of the act, that it yields, as birds are said to do to the fascinating influences of the serpent's eye constantly upon them. The unconquerable inclination to the commission of strange and unnatural acts which results from impressing the imagination with their image, is only an extreme case of the most familiar facts relating to the moral discipline of the character.

It appears that the relative number of suicides is considerably greater in large towns than in the country. In Prussia the city bear to the rural cases a proportion of seven to two. M. Guerry, in his work on the Moral Statistics of France, states, that, starting from whatever point, the relative frequency of suicide will be found to increase with the proximity to Paris. And just reverse of this he states to be the rule in murders and assassinations,—these appearing to be the most frequent, in relation to the numbers of inhabitants, where suicide is the least so. The comparative tendency to self-destruc-

tion in different countries, if the causes could be reached, would be a most curious and important investigation. It is said that in France and Germany the proportion of suicides is three or four times as great as in England. In the whole of England the proportion of cases is about one in nine thousand,—whilst in the department of the Seine, where however the most numerous cases occur, it is as one in every thirty-six hundred. Our author informs us that the prevalent notion of the comparative frequency of self-destruction in England during the foggy and gloomy month of November is a popular error, and that the bright month of June is the most fatal in the year. This we can well believe, and that to minds predisposed to melancholy, the gloom of nature would rather prove genial and soothing,—and a world all too gay and bright, depressing in the extreme. The result of all these facts would seem to be, that whilst the utmost tenderness of consideration is due to those who may be suffering from constitutional causes over which the will or the moral powers have no direct control, 'to rejoice evermore,' is the condition that should be aimed at, both as a physiological desideratum, and as the natural and healthy result of the activity, beneficence, and trust that belong to a religious principle of life.

The influences of SHAME are for the most part rather ludicrous than serious, flurrying and disordering, but committing no very fatal ravages,—though when it assumes the extreme form of wounded self-love it may produce a sense of humiliation that destroys the energies both of mind and body. The physical action, or natural language, of Shame is on the quickened circulation in the capillary vessels of the neck and head. The rush of the blood to the face may produce many of the disturbing and confusing effects which are the accompaniments of Shame. When this rush and confusion are overwhelming, apoplexy may readily result. Montaigne mentions, on the authority of Pliny, that "Diodorus the logician died upon the spot, from excessive shame, not being able in his own school, and in the presence of a great auditory, to resolve a quibbling question, which was propounded to him by Stilpo." Sensitive children suffer severely from the excitement of this passion,—nor is there a more delicate and difficult point connected with moral discipline, than the proper use of this sentiment in Education. It would perhaps be a safe Rule never directly to appeal to it,—but to be satisfied with presenting the circumstances in which it should come into play as a moral feeling. The attempt directly to excite it in sensitive natures gives it a morbid action, and in minds of ruder texture is likely to extinguish the scanty seeds of it which

Nature had implanted. Indeed to use any particular passion of the Mind, for a purpose, is one of the most dangerous experiments that can be attempted in Education.

Ambition, that 'last infirmity of noble minds,' even apart from its eventual disappointment, must be a source of suffering, inasmuch as it implies dissatisfaction with the present, and a doubtful and anxious anticipation of the future. In the efforts it excites, and the stimulus it imparts to all the powers of thought and action, it is notwithstanding a large contributor to the sum of human happiness. It is certainly the most subtle of the passions, and it would be difficult to say what virtue, or semblance of virtue, had none of its roots in this soil. In this, as in every other original part of our nature, the Passion is right, and requires only to be exercised in harmony with the highest laws of our being. The absence of ambition, of all kinds, can belong only to the sluggishness of beings to whom the Actual never suggests an Ideal. Humility itself looks upwards: for if it looked to things beneath it, it would grow proud,—and only the aspiring are meek. The evil and harrassing effects of ambition are not from the desire to reach the best models and standards that appertain to our pursuits in life, for that is a healthy and legitimate aim,—but from the weakness that loses all interest in dignifying and adorning the place we have and the work we do, whilst we seek some other place for which we have no clear directions that Providence designed us. The ambition that works outwards, and enlarges its room and place in the world from an inward development, is that which carries its rewards with it,—and as it proceeds from a moral and intellectual necessity is not severely affected by external disappointment. Plutarch tells an excellent story of Cineas asking Pyrrhus what he intended to do at last when he had conquered all, and become the uncontested sovereign of Greece. "Why then, my friend, said Pyrrhus laughing, we will take our ease, and drink, and be merry." To which Cineas replies: "And what hinders us from drinking and taking our ease now, when we have already those things in our hands, at which we propose to arrive through seas of blood, through infinite toils and dangers, through innumerable calamities, which we must both cause and suffer?"

Whilst treating of this passion the author gives this salutary admonition to his countrymen:—

"To the force of the same passion is it that the rash speculations so common among us, and so destructive both to peace of mind and health of body, are in a great measure imputable. This commercial gambling, for such may it be justly termed, will oftentimes be even more widely

ruinous in its consequences than that more humble sort to which our moral laws affix a penalty of so deep disgrace. For while the private gamester trusts to the fall of a die, or the turn of a card, but his own gold, the gambler on change risks on the hazards of the market, not what belongs to himself only, but too often the fortunes of those who had reposed their confidence in his honour; and may thus involve in one common ruin whole circles of kindred and friends. And yet such are the ethics of social life, that whilst the latter is respected, courted, and elevated to high places, the former is shut out of all virtuous society."

The influence of Imagination on health and happiness is a subject which requires a profounder knowledge of human nature than belongs to our author. He has collected however some useful remarks,—from which we take the following excellent observations of Dugald Stewart:—

"It was undoubtedly the intention of nature, that the objects of perception should produce much stronger impressions on the mind than its own operations. And, accordingly, they always do so, when proper care has been taken, in early life, to exercise the different principles of our constitution. But it is possible by long habits of solitary reflection, to reverse this order of things, and to weaken the attention to sensible objects to so great a degree, as to leave the conduct almost wholly under the influence of the imagination. Removed to a distance from society, and from the pursuits of life, when we have been long accustomed to converse with our own thoughts, and have found our activity gratified by intellectual exertions, which afford scope to all our powers and affections, without exposing us to the inconveniences resulting from the bustle of the world, we are apt to contract an unnatural predilection for meditation, and to lose all interest in external occurrences. In such a situation, too, the mind gradually loses that command which education, when properly conducted, gives it over the train of its ideas; till at length the most extravagant dreams of imagination acquire as powerful an influence in exciting all its passions, as if they were realities."

We cannot better point these rambling notices than by the closing paragraph, which gives the sum of the whole matter:—

"In concluding this volume let me again urge the important truth that there is no period of our existence, from opening infancy to closing age, wherein a prudent government of our moral, will not contribute a propitious influence to our physical constitution. Man unrestrained by discipline, or abandoned to the turbulence of unbridled passion, becomes the most pitiable and degraded of beings. The well-springs of his health and happiness are poisoned, and all the comeliness and dignity of his nature marred and debased. His whole life in reality is but a succession of painful mental and physical strugglings and commotions, a curse equally to himself and all around him.

"'Of all God's workes, which doe this worlde adorne,
There is no one more fair and excellent,
Than is man's body both for power and forme,
Whiles it is kept in sober government:
But none that is more fowle and indecent,
Distempered through misrule and passions base.'

"But although the passions implanted within us are the occasion of so great an amount of evil, both to the physical and moral constitution, so prolific a source of disease, sorrow, and ignominy, yet fortunately are they the subjects of education, and, as when uncontrolled they become the bane and reproach of our nature, under a wise restraint and prudent culture they may be rendered our richest blessing and fairest ornament."

Art. III.—LECTURES ON CERTAIN HIGH-CHURCH PRINCIPLES, COMMONLY DESIGNATED BY THE TERM PUSEYISM. By Thomas Madge. London: Longman, Brown, Green and Longman. 1844.

The ladies and gentlemen who frequent Exeter Hall are anxious that Queen Victoria should emulate the theological chivalry of her amiable predecessor King Henry VIII., and thus earn anew the honourable title of Defender of the Faith. But they would have her to do this in a gentle, passive, lady-like manner—more by expressive silence than wordy eloquence—more by what she will not do, than by what she will do. As Henry wrote a book, or suffered somebody else to write one for him, against the Heretics, and put his name to it, so they would have Victoria to write a Bill, or suffer somebody else to write one for her, in favour of the Unitarians, and *not* put her name to it.* Now there is something to us inexpressibly charming in this device. But we cannot linger upon it. These "advisers" of the Queen (who, however, can scarcely be called "responsible" in any sense of the word) have an antiquity in which they rejoice. It is the antiquity which begins with the year 1688, when by the liberal ecclesiastical policy of William III. most of themselves first became tolerated, and it ends with the year 1813, when Mr. W. Smith introduced his Bill for the relief of persons denying the Doctrine of the Trinity. Now this to them is the golden age of the Church, the primitive antiquity to which they would have all things conformed, the *semper, ubique et ab omnibus* of the Calvinistic and Methodist Dissenters. There will be no peace to Old England till this state of things is restored, and in the meantime luckily the Courts of Law are found to continue upon this model, among changing things themselves to be unchanged, and while Legislation warded off the effect of certain oppressive and tyrannous laws from our ancestors, the Courts of Law are discovered still to enforce them. Happy disparity between Law and Legislation! May the Queen bear testimony to the voice of Calvinistic antiquity, and refuse her sign-manual to any union between Parliament and Chancery!

* "If the Parliament were deaf to their prayer, they might address a higher power, and pray Her Majesty not to put her sign-manual to a document which, *if it did not destroy her right to the crown of her ancestors*, would certainly destroy her right to the title of Defender of the Faith."—(much cheering.) See Dr. Cooke's, of Belfast, threat from the platform of Exeter Hall against the Queen of England, as quoted in the Christian Reformer for June 1844.

Such is the character of one set of ecclesiastical absurdities which grace our æra. Mr. Madge's volume calls us to the consideration of another. A small knot of quiet contemplative men, occupying a few chambers in one of our Universities, look out upon the world from their college-greens and watch-towers (the very antipodes of the noisy Strand, and the still more noisy Exeter Hall), and discover that the principle of Free Inquiry, and the duty of individually-formed opinion, are playing sad havoc with the Church, with orthodoxy and with all ancient things. They see no natural termination to the effect of this principle but Socinianism, as they call it, or perhaps even Scepticism. They say, and say with equal candour and truth, 'Give men the Bible to read, and their own eyes and hearts alone to read it with, and they will infallibly reject the received dogmas of the Church and become Unitarians. But this, though a necessary result of such a principle, would be a fatal and deplorable result. Therefore if we would avoid the result, we must eschew the principle. The authority of the Church, which is the older principle, must be restored to its wonted place, and substituted for this new, Reformation-fashioned principle of Individual Inquiry.'

Such we conceive to be the real basis of Puseyism. It is said of at least one of the Leaders of this school, that he had burnt his own fingers in the fire, before he warned his comrades of it. And certainly their productions bear witness to the fact, that they have not adopted the system from lack of thought. They know the evils which they fear. They have tasted the fruits of free inquiry, and, as English churchmen, it has been bitter to their taste. They proceed upon the scheme of their old University Logic—not as inquirers into data, but reasoners from data. They do not set themselves to ask, are the Doctrines of the Church true? But they say, the Doctrines of the Church being true, what plan must we adopt to make men believe in them? Certainly not Free Inquiry: that leads us further and further from these doctrines. Then after all, our ancestors, before the days of the much-lauded Reformation, were right. Church-authority was the principle on which they held the world so long together; Church-authority is the principle on which we must seek to recover and to save that which has been lost. They then, undiscouraged by the fate of Sisyphus, take the huge stone of English mental freedom, and beginning at the very bottom of the hill, struggle to roll it up again. In the fact, as in the fable, partial success rewards their efforts, and mankind look on and say,—who could have supposed that that stone would have ever got so high up the hill again!

We always from our school-days pitied Sisyphus, and a sentiment of commiseration mingles with the unperturbed and steady faith with which we view this stone rolling up the mountain. The higher it goes, the greater will be the momentum with which it will come down again, and the Sisyphuses of the Church will not have the satisfaction of saying, "En! omnis effusus est labor," it will not be lost; the more labour they bestow on it, the more quickly will it come down again.

The Puseyites—and yet we ought not to use this name without apology. It is a nick-name. It is to them, what Socinian is to us, a term of opprobrium, though of distinction. We will call them, then, by that name in which they delight, the Anglo-Catholics—though we are Anglo-Catholics too. The Anglo-Catholics know what the principle of free Inquiry leads to, and reject it. The orthodox Dissenters do not know what it leads to, and therefore in words maintain it. What will they do, when it brings home to them, as one day it must, the strange and unexpected tidings of its mission? The Anglo-Catholics are right—we mean relatively to their purpose—when they say, if these things are to be believed, it can only be by maintaining the authority of the Church. The only question for them to consider is, whether they can maintain that authority—whether Freedom has not gone rather too far, whether the fish have not spread themselves abroad over too wide an expanse of waters ever to be caught again in one net?

What is it that they ask us to believe? First, that the Church of England is by uninterrupted spiritual descent the same Church as that founded by our Lord himself in Palestine, and that in Great Britain it is the only such Church, the only true Church, that is, the only Christian Church: that the Catholics of England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland, the Independents, Methodists, Quakers, Presbyterians and Baptists of the same countries, not belonging to it, are not in fact Christians. Secondly, that the Rev. A. B., curate, say of Pentre Voiles in North Wales, has received certain ancestral spiritual characteristics from one of the Apostles, just as he has received certain physical characteristics from one of the sons of Noah, and that in right of this spiritual lineage he says to Mr. Madge, as he innocently passes through that beautiful region on a summer-tour, following the words of Keble: "When I took ordination, I also received the presence of the Holy Ghost, partly to guide, direct and strengthen me in all my ways, and partly to assume unto itself, *for the more authority*, those actions that appertain to my place and calling. Whether I preach, pray, baptize, communicate, condemn, give absolution,

or whatever, as a disposer of God's mysteries; my words, judgments, acts and deeds are not mine but the Holy Ghost's." Mr. Madge, who has had as many opportunities of studying the Scriptures as the curate, and is thought by those who know him to possess some understanding and acuteness, looks for a moment astonished, but soon recovering himself, he kindly talks to the poor gentleman about the weather and the scenery, takes off his hat to him, and returns to his Inn, regretfully putting him down as insane. This is as it would be, if individuals spoke in this authoritative way to their brethren in the Christian ministry, when they encountered them on the road-side, but they ascend the pulpit or the printing-press, and say these things to the world, and we think them learned.

"By such lofty pretensions," as Mr. Madge almost by a compliment terms them, on the part of the never-changing and undying Church of Augustine and of Henry, the whole of the people of Great Britain are to be brought back to their senses and their obedience. We really and in truth feel some commiseration for the parties engaged in this silly attempt. We have so strong a sympathy with human nature in all its well-meant struggles and efforts, that we cannot see the vain errand, on which a respectable portion of it is now bent, without entertaining, not only regret at the universal waste of time which it causes, partly to those who are engaged in it, and partly to those who are opposed to it, but also a certain sense of sorrow for the sure disappointment of those many worthy enthusiasts who are thus walking so happily in their sleep.

When all the nation had one way of thinking, or rather of not thinking, and nearly all the nations too, this idea of one Apostolical Episcopal community, embracing all true Christians, had something of respectability about it. But now that the whole course of our national progress declares that no smaller fold than that of Christ himself can be made to comprehend our resolute diversities, that we will own but one master, even Christ, and that all we are brethren,—this effort to bring effete and dying theories to restrain the determined movements of mental freedom excites our pity or startles our contempt. It is as when an old actor comes forward once more in the decline of life to exhibit his decayed powers before an audience, that had in years gone by felt and acknowledged the vigour of his maturity, and the upshot of this attempt on the part of the Church will be that, like this old actor, when the farce is finished, it will make its bow, and retire, and never show its face again, to challenge an applause which it can no longer command, aim at a power of which it betrays but the loss, and

claim a respect and sympathy, which even in its sadly diminished form lasts but an evening, and disappears.

This way of treating the matter, however, though it may answer for an occasional comment, should not be the only one, even if it were the best. These claims, extraordinary as they may appear, are genuine and are advanced with sincerity. They must be opposed, then, with reasonings as complete, and remonstrances as grave, as those with which they are defended. At first the liberal minister of Religion looks at them with astonishment or amusement. And even when the movement really seems, from the amount of attention which it commands, to be something serious, he cannot for a long time bring himself to step upon such an arena. It is like setting himself deliberately to refute the science of the Alchymists, or the pretensions of Joanna Southcote. Nevertheless a sense of duty at length commands him to buckle on his armour, and he finds himself after the first onslaught engaged in a long-continued rout. He pursues the enemy through strange regions indeed, through sequestered valley, and woody copse, but always finds him flying. At times he hides himself in the gathered leaves and brushwood of some old forest, but the pursuer finds that it is only the darkness which affords him shelter, and when that is penetrated, the foe is compelled to take to his heels again.

Thus it is with Mr. Madge and his Anglo-Catholics. His book is one continued rout. He absolutely clears the field before him, as he proceeds. No living form or spectre of an argument remains to turn upon his rear. The battle-field of these lectures is strewn with the dead. If any Dissenting Minister, or any liberal Layman, is troubled with Anglo-Catholics in his neighbourhood, and has not time to work up his Bede and Gildas, his Chillingworth and Hooker, his Burnet and Stillingfleet, for a reply, let him read Mr. Madge's Lectures: unless he have a passion for original research, he will find everything he can require in them. Indeed this is the character of the volume before us. It is essentially, though in the best sense of the word, popular. The author does not pursue his subject into any very remote antiquity, or draw upon patristic lore. He very properly takes contemporaneous statements as indices of the condition of thought with which he has to do, and refutes them either from the pages of able and trustworthy writers of the last three centuries, or from the resources of his own acute and penetrating logic. Thus he is fonder of Burnet than Bede, of Hallam than Eusebius, and of Hooker than Theodoret. The lectures were intended for

instruction, not for ostentation, "for the people generally, not for the learned particularly." The author's object was not to add another to original works of reference, but to bring the gist and marrow of those works in an intelligible, attractive and convincing form before those who desired clear and determined views on this much-bruited subject. This was his design, and he has eminently succeeded in it.

He first shows what the principles of the school, against which he contends, really are. He then discusses the nature and constitution of a Christian Church;—what was the Apostolic form of government, and whether any specific external polity is binding upon Christians universally. He canvasses the three orders of clergy—shows that so far from Bishop, Priest and Deacon being from the first distinct orders, Bishop and Presbyter were titles given to the same individual, and that as for Deacons indicating the third or lowest order, Paul and Apollos themselves were styled Deacons. The doctrine of Apostolical succession next comes under review. Our author shows that according to Scripture, so far from ordination being an exclusively episcopal function, Paul and Barnabas were ordained by three brethren of the Church at Antioch, called prophets and teachers, that is, the higher order received ordination from the lower: that in fact, primitive ordination was nothing more than the invocation of the divine blessing on the election of a minister. Apostolical succession has no support from Scripture; there is nothing to support it, but the feeble analogy between Christ and his Apostles, and Aaron and his sons. It has no support from history; the first links of such a succession are wanting, those which connect the apostles themselves with the first known ordaining Bishop. On the worthlessness of this Apostolical succession, even if it could be proved, there is a striking passage:—

"The claims set up by the churches of England and Rome were also set up in times past by churches now branded with the name of heresy. This was the case with the Arian churches. These churches, it is well known, once prevailed to a considerable extent, and through many countries. As to their ecclesiastical constitution or form of government, they were episcopal, and had as fair a claim to the apostolic succession as any churches then in existence. But the orthodox party in spite of this claim, in defiance of the apostolic title possessed by their bishops, denounced them in the fiercest terms of condemnation. In the East the Greek Church also, which is at variance on points of faith with the Western Churches, has quite as good a claim as they have to the grace of 'the apostolic succession.' But this avails nothing with the orthodox believers. With them it forms of itself no bond of fellowship and union, presents no barrier to rejection and exclusion from the true Catholic Church of Christ. The Nestorian, the Eutychian, and other churches, all condemned by councils as heretical, present exactly the same title to the pos-

session of apostolic orders. So that, according to the showing of these high-church divines themselves, the simple fact of apostolic succession does not, on that account, imply the inheritance of apostolic endowments. For what reason, then, I ask, is the fact so earnestly insisted on, and so ostentatiously exhibited? It seems after all that there may be apostolic succession unaccompanied with apostolic gifts and graces. But if the apostolic orders be no security against the inroads of error, and no safeguard for the preservation of the truth, it ceases any longer to be a mark or sign of the true Church. Or, we may state the matter thus: On what grounds can one Church say to another Church possessing the same apostolic commission, we are certainly right, and you are as certainly wrong? I thought that the very object and design, the use and importance of these supposed apostolical orders, was to constitute the possessors of them, 'the hereditary witnesses of the truth.'* But if instead of being witnesses of the truth, they become witnesses of grievous and damnable errors, wherein lies the value, the efficacy of these 'orders?'"—pp. 120, 121.

In the Lecture on Tradition our author unveils the ground of its necessity to the Church: for in tradition alone can many of the tottering doctrines of the Church find their support, and an appeal to tradition requires a clergy, who shall be the depositories of it. We quote some appropriate passages on this point from a previous lecture. The Rev. W. J. E. Bennett is introduced as saying,

"If we are satisfied that Scripture is Scripture—that is, that our Bibles, as we possess them now, do contain God's real word—if in this we are satisfied, then let me mark out to you a few things, which I do not think you could, or any Christian could, have found out for himself in that Bible,—things which I do not imagine would have been articles of our faith so peremptorily pronounced as they are, had there not been such a thing as tradition or the teaching of the Church; for instance, *the doctrine of the Holy Trinity*. Is it possible, my brethren, do you think, that you or I, or any one, be he ever so gifted with the powers of man, could have deduced and invented for himself this most wonderful and mysterious doctrine out of the Bible?"—Lectures, p. 113.

So other of the Tractarian writers speak of the *Personality of the Holy Ghost*, the doctrines of *original sin*, and *the atonement*. These are tremendous concessions from orthodoxy. What more can we want to satisfy us of the correctness of our views as deductions from the Bible? What further need have we of witnesses; behold we have heard their confessions!

The remaining lectures are occupied with the consideration of the sufficiency of Scripture, the right of private judgment, the state-connection of the English Church, and the essential prin-

* "The treasure of sound doctrine," says Mr. Keble, "is guarded by the grace of the apostolical succession."—Tradition, p. 42. If so, then it follows that the Arian as well as the Athanasian clergy of former days, the Greek and Romish as well as Anglo-Catholic doctors of the present day, are all the guardians of sound doctrine, for they all alike boast of possessing the apostolic succession.

ciples of Christian Catholic Church. We bid farewell and godspeed to this most useful and spirited volume with a concluding extract from the Sixth Lecture.

After quoting a number of historical and contemporaneous facts, in proof of the masterdom exercised by the State over the Church of England, and a number of querulous acknowledgments on the part of the Anglo-Catholics of this their condition, our Author asks;

"Of all these passages taken together—what are we to think? One is almost tempted to ask, is it possible for them to have been written by persons who are really members and ministers of the Church of England? Could a stronger bill of indictment against that Church have been drawn up by its bitterest opponents? If the English Church be in this state of degradation and debasement; if it be thus dragged at the chariot-wheels of the State; if it be thus manacled in all its limbs and hampered in all its movements; why not burst asunder the bonds of its oppression, and assert its freedom and independence?"—p. 256.

"If the Anglo-Catholic divines really think that they are spiritually descended from the Apostles, and that by virtue of this descent they are authorized and entitled to rule and govern the Church, it is on their part nothing less than a gross dereliction of principle, or a melancholy instance of pitiable weakness, to bow before the shrine of human greatness, and surrender to the Civil Magistrate the authority and the trust which they solemnly declare Christ delegated solely to the 'successors of the Apostles.' Let them give up the notion of divine right, of apostolic succession, of an authoritative priesthood, or cease to act in a way that puts all such claims and pretensions to shame and confusion. Connected with the State, and aided by its powers and wealth, it is well—well for freedom, humanity and justice, that the Church should be ruled and governed by the State. Separated from it, and resting on her spiritual character alone, her clergy may take the guidance and direction of her affairs in their own keeping, and advance what pretensions they please. Their dream of apostolic descent may be innocently indulged in, as far at least as other churches and communions are concerned, however it may inflate their own vanity, or flatter and aggrandize their own self-importance. As long as the State will throw its broad shield of protection alike over all, religious liberty is safe; and, proudly as the ministers of the Anglo-Episcopal Church may boast of their apostolic descent, that boast, when all temporal power has been taken out of their hands, will excite no alarm, and may, peradventure, be the occasion of some little amusement."—pp. 269, 270.

Art. IV.—POVERTY AND ITS REMEDIES.

One of the worst effects of deeply rooted and wide spreading social calamities is the insensibility and hopelessness which they tend to engender, in regard both to themselves and to their cure. The bulk of men but too easily learn to look with calmness on sufferings which are constantly under their eye, and he whom these sufferings move to consider whether they admit of a remedy, is too apt to be overpowered by the very magnitude of the evil, and to sink eventually into quiescence if not despair. We are all prone to feel, and many to argue, that evils must be because they are, will continue since they have ever been; and consequently that as they defy remedial appliances, so to attempt their cure would be little else than a species of social Quixotism.

The mistake involved in this too prevalent state of mind is the desire which it evinces of some signal and imposing reward of benevolent effort. We wish to stay the evils of society at a blow. And if we cannot produce a reformation no less entire than sudden, most of us are apt to sink at once into inactivity if not hopelessness. This unhealthy love of the grand and stupendous is among the most effectual hindrances to those who are benevolently inclined. The thirst for individual distinction generally ends in disappointment, and disappointment brings disgust. The benevolent enthusiast soon finds reason to think that in spite of him the world goes on in its old course, and he therefore speedily withdraws from a career where he fancies his toil is unrepaid, because it has not realised the fond visions he had formed.

But having begun his work in a dream, he quits it under a delusion. "My toil is unrewarded," he affirms, and straightway leaves the plough unworked. And so is every one likely to do, who is not content to work as a day-labourer in the vineyard of benevolence, thanking God for so good a sphere of occupation, and disregardful of his own rank therein; and glad, if he is unable to produce a harvest, to bring to maturity the humblest root. If evils are not removed, it is something for humanity, for ourselves and for God, that they are abated. We may not have the power to convey to a place of safety and comfort, the exhausted and dying traveller on whom we light in the arid desert of social life; shall we therefore keep from his parched lips and craving eye the cup of cold water which we hold in our hands? We cannot put an end to poverty, but have we not each the

means of relieving one poor child? Hydra-headed ignorance defies our strength and defeats our vigilance. What then—we can instruct one mind, and thereby make at least one happy, one virtuous home. Happiness and Virtue are things in their nature too precious for us to be justified in neglecting the smallest opportunities for encouraging their growth. It is a God-like work to give birth to even but one virtuous emotion in the breast of another.

The great mistake, however, and the mistake to which we would mainly ask the attention of the reader—the great mistake in the feeling of which we spoke, is that which infers the permanency of an evil from the mere fact of its existence. Poverty is and will be; it is idle to think of rooting it up. A certain fate is recognised in human affairs even by those who call themselves Christians. The stream of events which has come down from the past, is perpetuated indefinitely into the future. That future will be but the reflected image of preceding days; the wailings of poverty in the age that is and the ages that have gone will be ceaselessly reverberated from each age to come.

At least this painful conclusion is not forced upon us by the argument employed. It does not follow that because poverty is, poverty will be. We say there is no necessary connection between the two propositions. They may be linked together as cause and effect in the mind of many, but the bond is not necessary: it is of man's origination, not God's. Moral effects ever take their complexion from the causes whence they spring, and poverty may be one of those evils whose tendency it is, under a good Providence, to work their own cure. And except we are much mistaken, something of this kind has already taken place. Poverty indeed is still a terrible evil in the midst of us—but it is not the evil that it once was. A remedial process, slow indeed but effectual in its operation, has been going on ever since Jesus disclosed the dignity of man's moral nature, and preached the gospel to the poor.

And generally it is an unfounded however prevalent a notion, that what has been will be, and that the future in each age will be little else than the past re-produced. Find in the days that are gone, the original whence the present day was copied. Where is the type of Grecian civilization? All the great social changes have appeared follies till they were effected, so dissimilar and often so foreign is the spirit of one age to the spirit of another. Least of all is it for us of this day to make the future but an echo of the present. The achievements with which the efforts of the wise and good have been crowned within the last three centuries, separating

the period so widely as they do from any preceding æra, not only forbid despair, but justify even enthusiasm, and carry the mind forward on the wings of hope, into the midst of moral changes, as pleasing and as wonderful as are the physical and intellectual triumphs we are now delighted to behold. When the once dark and pathless waves of the Atlantic are compassed in a few days by a vessel which bears to a recently unknown world the imperishable monuments of human genius and the proud records of European benevolence, under the impulse of a power whose changes are only just beginning to be felt, and which promises to affect for good or for ill, but mainly, we trust, for good, all the interests of our existing civilization, it would be as idle to see the future in the present, as it would be wrong to despond of the destinies of our race or our country.

There is however an error connected with religion, on which we must say a few words. Many religionists regard poverty as an indestructible element in human society, and they think they find a warrant for their belief in the words, "Ye have the poor with you always." (Matt. xxvi. 11.) In their opinion the Scripture is thus pledged to the perpetuity of poverty, and therefore, though they may labour to alleviate its evils, yet as poverty is with them of divine ordination, and consequently lasting as man's sojourn on the earth, they would never think it their duty to attempt its eradication. Benevolence thus loses the mighty arm of religion in that work which is of all others most needful and most important, we mean the destruction of poverty root and branch.

Such and so baneful is the effect of error, especially of religious error; and such and so baneful is the effect of false principles in the interpretation of holy writ. Our Lord does not say that poverty shall not disappear till time shall be no more. He does not affirm that the evil is irremediable. What are his words?

"Ye have the poor with you always." To whom was this said? To every generation till "the last man?" So the language is taken—but taken without authority and without reason. The circumstances were special, which gave rise to the remark, and with the existence of those circumstances the remark itself ceased to have its application. The words denote not the perpetuity of a social condition, but the prior claims of personal regard. Mary the sister of Lazarus, impelled by gratitude, veneration and regret, anointed the feet of Jesus with costly spikenard, and was reproved because she had not rather sold the ointment and given its price to the poor. Whereon Jesus said, "Let her alone, why trouble ye her, for the poor always ye have with you, but me ye have not always."

If these things did not make it clear that our Lord intended nothing more than to intimate that while the reprovers of Mary had an opportunity of showing mercy to the poor whenever they pleased, the time for acts of kindness to himself was limited and drawing to a close, and consequently that the offered token of affection was both proper and seasonable; the addition which Mark makes to the words of Jesus on the occasion would remove any remaining doubt: "And whensoever ye will, ye may do them good." 'Ye have the poor with you always, and whensoever ye will, ye may do them good, but me ye have not always. She hath done what she could; she is come aforehand to anoint my body to the burying.' 'Charity to the poor is an every day duty which may well yield precedence to an act of attention to myself, since the poor ye have always with you, but I am about to quit you for ever.'

The New Testament then is not pledged to the perpetuity of poverty, and we are at liberty not only to speculate on the subject as on any other element of social life, but, what is more and better, we are, as followers of Christ, at liberty to labour for its extirpation. And it is in the hope of offering some encouragement for so pious, yet beyond a doubt so difficult a work, that we are attempting to show that no inevitable necessity, no changeless and despotic will, no religious authority, no irreversible law, dooms man to the frightful and numerous evils of poverty. On the contrary we have a humble hope that even for its maladies a remedy will be found.

But what do we mean by poverty when we speak of the probability of its being finally eradicated? We do not mean that opulence will be universal. We never expect, we do not desire, to see the day when labour shall be done away. We have no vision in our mind of a social equality. Still less do we wish to make the poor wealthy, by making the wealthy poor. If with any persons these are ought but day-dreams, they are evils in the disguise of good. But what we do want to see, what we should think life a small sacrifice to bring to pass, is the day when honest industry shall be universal, and honest industry bring of itself a sufficiency for all the real wants of human life. By poverty then we mean either a dependent sufficiency, or an independent insufficiency; and by the poor we intend the necessitous—the necessitous from whatever cause—those who have to look beyond their own homes and their own resources for aid in the supply of their wants. Our wish is to behold each individual—each family sustained by its own exertions. We would put away want; we would destroy servile dependence; we wish to see each man "satisfied," as is the good man, "out of himself," out

of the labour of his own hands, or the labour of his own head; satisfied with such and so much earthly good as will keep his body in health and vigour, sustain and encourage the operations of his mind, give free play to the domestic affections, and thus enable the individual to prepare for immortality. This is what we want. More, we ask neither for ourselves nor others; less, we will not, if we can help it, take; less, no one ought to take. His duty to himself, his duty to his family, nay to his kind and his God, forbid it. Will the day ever come when this good will be generally realised? Are the great bulk of our fellow-countrymen condemned to live in dependence and vegetate on the very edge of destitution? Poverty is a shocking,—is it an irreparable evil? We trust not.

What are its causes? Let us descend to its roots. Can they be destroyed? If not there is no hope.

1. In their general character, we consider the causes of poverty to be moral in their origin, and therefore admitting of a moral cure. If this be a fact, we here find at once a ground of hope. Moral evils may be inveterate, stubborn and terrible, but in regard to tribes, nations, or the world, they are not beyond the reach of suitable remedies.

The evils which have their origin out of the sphere of man, man can only partially abate; their entire removal he attempts in vain. The lightning which smote the progenitors of Franklin smites his descendants. The blow may be less frequent, but it is not less sure. A failure of food brings inevitable destruction. If the supply be limited by any power which man cannot reach and alter, then is poverty as incurable as it is afflicting. But as the earth has been given of God, not to classes or nations, but to man, and as it yet presents rich and boundless tracts to his enterprise and skill, so are we relieved from the necessity of considering what his condition would be, if 'cabin'd, cribb'd and confined' by nature itself. It is enough to remark that with the birth of each individual there comes into existence, in strength of body and endowments of mind, power for the supply of all his wants, with the world all before him where to choose his sphere of exertion.

Of course these general statements are to be taken with much qualification, but they contain, we submit, truth enough to warrant the conclusion that, speaking generally, man is not the slave of any outward necessity, is not weighed down under the load of any physical pressure; that he may eat and drink, educate himself and educate his family if he will. It is therefore with the will of man that we have to do; with that which is of moral origin and open to moral appliances. Affect man's

will, you affect his fate. Lead him to resolve to be independent, and you have destroyed poverty.

We consider that all the causes of poverty are ultimately referrible to ignorance. Men do not know the conditions of individual and social happiness, and on that account so many are in want and wretchedness. These conditions are the laws of God; a father's appointments and institutions, designed expressly and fitted most admirably for the furtherance of individual and general good. In ages of darkness man saw not, or mistook these arrangements; in this age of comparative light, man but very partially knows of their existence, or comprehends their bearing; and a large and bitter heritage of suffering does each age in consequence transmit to the next.

The great and the influential portions of society are not the least ignorant of the essential conditions of social happiness. We now speak of their want of knowledge in its effects, not on themselves so much as on the people at large. The present mistake of the upper classes is, that they have treated their fellowmen not as brothers but as slaves. Having by some means gotten the upper hand, they have spared no efforts to keep it. Society is based at present on the principle of inequality, and all its arrangements and practices are true to its fundamental principle. Hence power on the one side, subjection on the other. Hence property aggregated in comparatively few hands, and the great bulk of the pople left with a very scanty share. Hence laws which the privileged orders make, and with which the unprivileged have nothing to do but to obey them. Hence corruption in order to make the people instruments in maintaining the existing system. Hence coercion to punish and restrain instead of education to develop power, and form character, among the industrious classes. And hence too charity in place of justice—but here we must not stop with a vague generality. Charity instead of justice! Such has been, such is the practice in this land. And the parties who are guilty of this wrong, take merit to themselves as being among the benefactors of their kind. But give the poor justice,—they will not need charity. Great indeed the merit of taking and keeping the gold yourselves, and doling out to others a few grains of the brass of social life! Charity in place of justice is an insult as well as an injury. We like not the name as between man and man. He who eats the bread of charity is a slave. One crumb thereof changes the relation in which he stands, and ought to stand, as a brother and a fellow-citizen with all around him. The people should scorn charity, for they suffer its greatest inflictions. The powerful and the rich should give justice in its stead, for this

gross social injustice of granting that as a favour which ought to be earned and had as a right, is an evil to them as well as a scourge to the people, and is even now undermining the very basis on which the privileged classes stand. Justice is the only sure foundation of the social fabric. Wherever there is a master class, and a slave class, there is peril and poverty and disorder as well. Nations are beginning to awaken to these great truths. When they are generally known and felt, then the principles which will mould the institutions of society are brotherhood and equality, and then, but not before, poverty will cease, together with the causes which have given so crushing an evil birth.

Let us now look for a moment to those classes among whom chiefly indigence is engendered, and alas! at the present hour, abounds. In what we are about to remark, we have no intention to give the slightest pain. But whether pain is given or not, we must speak what we consider truth. We write not to praise or to blame, but to probe to its sources a grievous wound; and as we will not on such an issue flatter the rich, so we must not be indulgent to the poor. Indeed we pity the poor too much, and love all men too well, to allow ourselves, on so grave a question at least, to employ any terms but what a strict regard to facts may justify.

The great cause of poverty among the poor themselves is still ignorance. The origin of the disease is moral; moral therefore may the cure be. And in this reflection we have not seldom found consolation when we have looked with weeping heart on the sufferings of the needy. It would be a terrible thought indeed if one were compelled to believe that chained down in the iron bonds of a relentless fate, or under the brute force of an inexorable law, the indigent and wretched father and mother were doomed to hand over their heritage of woe unmitigated to their children, who in their turn would serve only to beget beggars and perpetuate destitution. But how squalid soever the appearance of some, however bitter their cup, there is an alleviation for those who wish their fellow creatures well, in the thought that as the disease so the remedy is of human origin, and that the poorest and least happy may do something to lessen the woes, if not of this generation, yet of that which is rising up,—and thereby, with suitable assistance, to bring indigence to an end.

Manifold are the ways in which ignorance among the people engenders indigence. We can speak but of two—improvidence and vice.

Improvidence is clearly the offspring of ignorance. With the casualties to which man is liable from causes at once numerous and inevitable—with the *peculiar* casualties to which the working man is liable—he who carries all his resources in his hands—he, who is the sport of every fluctuation which commerce may undergo—with these casualties extending through the whole of life, but thickening and darkening as we draw towards its close, nothing but sheer ignorance can permit men to squander their means when abundant—nothing but actual experience would persuade one that they would not strain every nerve to make some, however small, provision against an evil day. It may be felt that this observation implies that the industrious possess the power of laying up a store against the dark time to come. Such we hold to be the fact. After all the unequal legislation by which the people have been laden with burdens grievous to be borne; after all—with the energies that belong to that noble blood which flows in the veins of every Englishman—it is possible for virtuous industry to gain a sufficiency at least for the body, and, with some privation, to make a slender provision for seasons of want.

We are now speaking of the great body of this nation generally, and know that there are many exceptions to the facts to which we are about to allude. With this qualification we ask whether—to say nothing more of the want of forethought—unthriftiness is not the cause of a very large share of the family discomfort which prevails? It is waste that makes a huge portion of our actual want; it is not knowing how to turn a penny to the best account; it is the occasional indulgence in luxuries; it is buying at the worst hand because debt prevents our buying at the best; it is in the perpetual anticipation of our resources week by week, the year round, by which people tax themselves frequently at one tenth of their income, are always in arrears, always in peril, and consequently never at ease; it is in the sums—vast sums for a poor man—that are squandered every year on clubs which fail at the very moment of need; on projects which end generally in disappointment and often in deception. These are among the most prolific causes of the indigence we deplore. We verily believe that a knowledge of their true interests would at the present moment destroy at once more than one half of the sufferings of the poor. It is a very large amount of their actual woe that the industrious classes hold in their own hands, and ignorantly inflict upon themselves. If they are in earnest for the amelioration of their condition, let them look at home; let them see

what improvements lie in their own power. To themselves must they look; upon themselves must they depend; others may aid, but from themselves must their Salvation come.

Among the causes of Indigence, we have mentioned vice. This cause also rises and may terminate with man. Vice we consider as the great mistake, whose appropriate, whose only cure and prevention is knowledge. If in theology atheism is folly, in morals vice is downright infatuation. The merest prudential considerations have intrinsic weight enough to make vice appear as foolish as it is baneful. And will not knowledge —knowledge in the full and proper sense of the term—knowledge of the essential conditions of human happiness—go far in time to banish vice, and, with vice, its foul but too natural offspring, penury and pauperism? We are not looking for the vision of a millenium upon earth. Moral perfection in this state we shall never behold; and it is very unlikely that our remote posterity will be saluted with the grateful sight. But between vice and perfection there are many degrees of comparative goodness, and we do cherish the hope that knowledge will so far in time remove vice from the midst of us, as to put an end to indigence. Even at the present moment, if the millions of money that are annually expended by the people of this nation, on gratifications which are not only not needful to happiness, but tend to destroy it;—many of which unstring the body, debase the mind, peril the soul—breaking up domestic peace, and sapping the very foundations of our country's strength;—if these vast sums—thus worse than squandered—were applied to useful purposes, how would the face of society brighten, its burdens being lessened, its strength doubled, its morality renovated; and the sons of old England prove once more a race of hardy, true-hearted men, true to themselves, their country and their God. Even if the property still criminally wasted in drugging body and soul with narcotics were unreservedly cast into the Atlantic, our country would be a gainer; and every family, every individual who added his mite to the sacrifice, would be forthwith repaid in health of body and satisfaction of mind. No! with these facts before us, we cannot allow that, after all, it is property so much as knowledge that the people need. His resources will never cease to be insufficient, increase as they may, who knows not how to make a good use of what he has. Wisdom will make small means do more for happiness, than ignorance or folly can draw from the most splendid affluence. It is not so much what we have as how we use it, that keeps penury out of doors and comfort safe within. Property is power, and power in the hands of igno-

rance is only an instrument of evil. It is knowledge and the virtues which ensue, that give wealth its worth; and they can take from poverty its sting.

This leads us to present one or two considerations which afford positive encouragement to the hope that indigence will at length disappear. We have called knowledge the panacea of our social ills. We do not mean by knowledge the treasures of information which are found in books. We do not mean any mere intellectual influence. We do not restrict ourselves to the expansion and culture of the domestic affections. These things are good; but there is something yet higher and better. If man is to be reformed, he must be treated as a religious as well as an intellectual and moral being; and by knowledge, consequently, we intend all those sacred and ennobling influences which address the higher capabilities of man, and do as much for the increase of our efficiency for earth, as to prepare us for the holy joys of heaven.

Now we affirm that the sum of these influences—after every deduction is made—is in the present day very great, and continually on the increase, and is incomparably greater than at any previous period. Unless we are mistaken, a much deeper interest is felt in man as man; in his moral nature, in his immortal welfare; in the condition of the people generally, in the causes and cure of the evils under which they suffer. We have no doubt that the increase is by thousands in this country of those who are thinking, and writing, and toiling to raise the industrious classes. The very thought of a National education is a grand idea, and replete with hope. Class interests are passing out of sight to give place and prominence to Man. But our best ground of hope is in the fact that the people themselves are awaking to the consideration of their condition, and of the means by which it may be improved. Sturdy thinkers are now to be found scattered throughout their body; and noble-hearted and devoted men too—men who are equal to any sacrifice to which duty may eventually point. Knowledge is at work, is doing its work. The leaven which shall leaven the whole lump is beginning to ferment. Readers exist now by tens of thousands, where fifty years since only scattered units could be found. The very literature which a century ago was limited to a few of the higher classes, and in its influence on them formed the minds which created what is good in the present age, is now operating on large masses of the people, and, together with other literature and other refining influences called into being by new and widely-spread social wants, is forming the mind of those who will give its shape and com-

plexion to the coming age; and so onward age after age, the circle of light ever expanding over the surface of society, till, like the dial illumined by the meridian sun, the whole of our land shall be covered with its radiance.

We have also a very strong confidence in humanity when once its better feelings have been called into play. It is no small thing for the people to have been sent in quest of the true secret of happiness. It is no small thing for so many strong heads to have been set a thinking; so many energetic hearts to have been inspired by the spirit of benevolence; so many sincere and earnest spirits to have received a religious mission to their lost companions. It will be found that if other classes are more cautious and refined, the industrious are more successful, because more devoted when they apply themselves to social reforms. It will be found that an earnest, straightforward simplicity of purpose will again confound the wisdom of the wise, and put the accomplished talker about civilization to an open shame. More still—it will be found that the people have a religion of their own, and a heroism of their own,—a holy, moral heroism—a real personal religion which will be as the still small voice of God in working out the much needed and earnestly desired good of society at large. Little indeed do they know the people who could ever doubt this. Yes, they have their spirit of benevolence, their deeds of mercy; it is from the hand of poverty that thousands of needy men and women receive their sole relief. But why think of money merely, when there are other gifts more costly and more acceptable? Whence do the poor get the sympathy so dear to us all, but from the poor? Who watches by the bedside of the sick or dying? We do not ask who puts up the single prayer, or administers extreme unction, but who are there at the close of day, and in the morn, and when the clock sounds midnight, and when the city is all of a rush; who moistens ever and anon the parched lips, and relieves the weary head? Who spares a morsel from a scanty portion for children that have a scantier portion still? Who deny themselves in order to keep their aged parents from the degradation of a workhouse? Who will add another mouth to their half-fed family by adopting the orphan rather than he should be cast friendless on the mercies of the world? Yes! yes! there is power enough for good among the people;—it only wants direction. It is not love but knowledge that they lack; and when their generousness shall have become enlightened, it will prove in itself and in its effects true Christian heroism. And if they will take a word of advice from one who would be proud to be accounted their friend,

let them encourage the growth of all the kindly and generous sentiments, by their steady and consistent exercise of them; and whatever ends they may seek to gain, let them be such as Christian benevolence approves, and let their ends be sought only by those means which will conduce to the softening and enrichment of their own hearts. The power of love was the power of Christ, is still the power of his gospel, and is the only influence which is irresistible.

But our great hope is in a Christian Providence. The existence of indigence with the prevalence of the spirit of the gospel we account an impossibility. The principles, the spirit and the aims of Christianity, are all remedial of the ills of poverty. If God is really the Father of humankind, he regards the destitute with peculiar love, and will not cease to seek and secure his good. If Jesus stands at the head of a great spiritual brotherhood, in which service is the highest honour, and sacrifice true happiness, his rule is proceeding so as to bring about the subversion of caste, of clan, of exclusiveness of every kind,—is uprooting the low passions of which these evils are born and on which they flourish; nor will this humanizing influence cease till it has broken down every middle wall of partition, and made all men one in the sublime commonwealth of a truly Catholic church. If under Christ love is the fulfilling of the law, and the life of the son of man is the exposition and the enforcement of that law, then so far as a real Christianity prevails in society, must indigence disappear. The spirit of him who died for man is his religion embodied. Equally is it the great recreative power of modern society. Who needs be told that it is incompatible with destitution? It is at the present day coming forth from the hard husks of tradition and dogma, appearing in its own pure form, instinct with life, and will, we believe, prove the seminal principle of a new and lofty reformation. But the aims of Christianity? Are they not all moral? Do they not all look to man's spiritual, that is, his real and lasting happiness? Some men seem to have an unaccountable aversion to religion, even to the religion of Jesus. Why! religion is the poor man's best friend, in its very nature and essence his best friend, because it seeks his moral and everlasting good. And it is so for this reason among others, that man's moral good cannot be attained apart from his physical well-being. While we are in the body, the soul cannot be saved if the body is wasted away and destroyed by want. It is a delusion, and sometimes a wicked deceit, which directs the destitute to look to the future state for the adjustment of their wrongs. To heaven they may indeed appeal, nor will the ap

peal be vain. But earth also they are bound to care for, if for no other reason than this, that a preponderance of happiness on earth is essential to enable man to prepare for the pursuits and the enjoyments of heaven, so that if Christianity is pledged to the attainment of our spiritual perfection, it is pledged also to the eventual removal of indigence. If God has willed the one, he has also willed the other, since in willing the end he must have willed the means. The cure cannot be effected while the source of the disorder remains, nor apart from the employment of the indispensable instrumentality. Providence administered by Christ, will find resources in the infinitude of its power, for destroying want, the greatest of all hindrances to the progress of the gospel. Christianity cannot prevail till it has slain the monster odious to God, and baleful to man, the monster poverty. If poverty is for ever to afflict the earth, it is also ordained that Christianity shall not bless it. But just in the degree in which the kingdom of Christ shall come, will indigence retire, and individual excellence, domestic comfort, and social security and peace abound.

J. R. B.

Art. V.—RETRENCHMENT OF THE HOURS OF BUSINESS.

We are the children of a stirring age. The principles of good and evil are in active and close opposition. Turn wherever we may, we find that Benevolence is waging a searching war of extermination with wretchedness. The great struggle that is going on is everywhere resolvable into numbers of lesser struggles, which carry the spirit of the whole into each specific part.—We take peculiar pleasure in the thought, that we have endeavoured, as far as the resources at our disposal would permit, to evince our deep and earnest interest on such portions of this contest as have come successively before us. We are well aware that we have passed many such subjects in silence, but we are conscious of having done so, only from a regretted necessity. But, with respect to some of these subjects, our notices though unavoidably tardy, may not even now be too late. We may yet make or attach a few more friends to their cause. At all events, it is in this hope that we take pen in hand, when the opportunity presents itself; and, should that hope ever fail us, our occupation will be gone, and we shall drop the pen which will then have become useless, as the soldier drops his broken sword.

The subject, on which we now propose to offer a few remarks, is one that has, for some time past, been attracting to it a growing share of attention. It respects the evils of what is called the Late-Hour System of Business. The object is to procure the closing of shops engaged in the retail trade, at such an hour in the evening, as may give the assistants employed in them some leisure for the indulgence of the domestic and social affections, for needful and healthy recreation, and for the cultivation of their minds. It is contended, that this is a duty which society owes to the numerous individuals thus engaged in its service; and it is also contended, that this act of social justice involves no change that will be eventually detrimental to the employer or to the public.

This cause has been taken up in several of our leading communities with a considerable degree of energy and success. In London, Liverpool, Manchester, Wolverhampton, &c., it has been advocated and supported in a spirit most honourable to those who evinced it. No abuse, no violence, no *strike* against the existing system, has been attempted or contemplated.

It has been taken up as a cause, which required circumspection no less than enthusiasm, and in which the interests of the one party were only to be consulted in the full recognition and remembrance of the claims and feelings of the other. What has been rare in attempts of this kind has here, it appears to us, been remembered and acted upon from the beginning. The reformers have avoided, with great tact and delicacy, raising any wanton hostility against the meditated reform. They seem to have learned wisdom from the painful experience of many, who, with the best intentions, have often only shown a benign truth to the world, to wrap it at once in clouds, through which none but privileged eyes could form a judgment of its brightness, and none but elect hearts bear witness to its power. This at least has been the impression produced upon us, by what we have seen and heard of the conduct of this undertaking. The first steps have cost nothing to the cause. They have been taken with a rare and beautiful circumspection. The process of making friends has not been confounded with that of making enemies. It has afforded a fine illustration of the text, that "wisdom dwells with prudence;" and we should have no fear of the final issue of the controversy, could we be perfectly sure that the same spirit of moderation and discretion would preside over the zeal of all its future friends.

The attempt appears to be one fully justified by the circumstances of those for whom it is made. Of the thousands and tens of thousands of assistants now engaged, throughout these kingdoms, in the various departments of retail business, few will think that the condition is enviable—many will feel that it is truly deplorable. From an early hour in the morning, to a very late one at night (with the exception only of the time necessary for taking food), they are occupied in a kind of labour, of which, as it is indispensable, we should not wish to say anything more, than that, thus unbrokenly prolonged, it must be very wearisome and exhausting. Labour of this kind admits of so little variety, that its monotony must contribute not a little to its oppressiveness. And the Assistant, it must be remembered, has not the Master's prospects and feelings, to buoy him up, and inspirit his exertions. He has no interest of property in that which he displays, or disposes of. His salary indeed demands a certain degree of success in the concern which employs him; but, beyond that point, its success or comparative failure involves no hopes that can brighten or diversify his lot. His duties have less to do with hope than with fear; but, with the healthy mixture and freshening interchange of both, he has no more to do than the lamp, the desk, or the counter.

The duties of the assistant are duties that *must* be done. Shops must have counters, tradesmen must have help, and goods must be exhibited to the customers who are to buy them. Nothing of this is objectionable; and nothing is objected to. The point in debate is not the nature of the duty, but the length of the time. It is this that carries labour into exhaustion, and drains from overwrought obedience the life-blood of cheerfulness and health. Many, on trying the experiment, would find that the confinement of a single day, from morning to night, in one of these retail occupations, would send them back jaded and spirit-worn to their homes. Few of them would be desirous of repeating the trial, yet if any were resolute to do so, they would find that no continuance of the practice could extract from it any latent principle of refreshment or improvement. What must it be then to those, in whose case it spreads over the years of youth, adolescence and manhood, who know nothing of the morning, but that it summons them to their shops, or of evening, but that its latest hours will dismiss them outworn to their rest! Surely, this is an unnatural history of any human life. Industry is one thing, Slavery is another; and we own that we see, in the shopman thus over-worked, a very near approach to a well-dressed and unbadged slave.

We will suppose, that no injury were occasioned to health from the prevalence of this practice. We will suppose, that the life of the counter, such as it now is, had no prejudicial effect upon the constitution. This concession, if we could make it, would not at all reconcile us to the system. We should still see, and still affirm, that a life, which allowed no respite from such occupations, could not be a life suitable to a rational and responsible creature,—could neither minister to the needs of his being, nor draw forth its capabilities, nor discipline for its issues. We are contending for much more than the timely dismission of a wearied animal to its rest. We demand for a being, who has, or may hope for, a home, the time which may enable him to partake of its blessings and to reciprocate its affections. We demand for a being, who belongs not to himself alone, the opportunity to mix, on fairer terms, with society —to be a living unit, and not a cypher among his kind. We demand for a being, who has a mind to appreciate literature, or to rejoice in the light of science, the opportunity to avail himself of the splendid advantages of his day. More solemnly still, we demand for a being, formed and fitted for scenes to which the present are only preparatory, the leisure to listen to the still small voice within him, which tells him that man was not made only to buy and to sell, but to work out amid the lowly

claims and daily cares of this world, the principle of a nobler life, and the sympathies of a diviner home.

It has been objected to this innovation, and not without much speciousness, that, in making these claims for the assistant tradesmen, we are putting into their mouths the expression of wants, of which they themselves are little conscious, and of regrets for privations, which they have left it to others to feel for them. There is some truth in this; but it is partial truth, and therefore liable to mislead us. These complaints, we imagine, have not been *generally* made by the body to which they are referred; but we do not apprehend that this admission can render them less just, less applicable, or less worthy of attention and redress. The slave-trade would still have been carried on to the disgrace of humanity, and the shame and sorrow of religion, if we had waited for the complaints of the slaves themselves, before we attempted to redeem them. Wilberforce, Clarkson, and others, spoke *for* the sufferers, who had nothing to say for themselves, though they died by hundreds in the pestilential hold, or went forth in gangs to the sound of the fetter and the scourge. We have here a kind of domestic slave-system of our own; and we must ask for it at least this justice—that it be not considered undeserving of attention, because the evils and privations, complained of as belonging to it, are revealed to us but by a small number of those affected by them, or by those, who only suffer from them through the sufferings of others.

Neither can we attach any weight to the objection which is made to the claims of the assistant tradesmen for a larger share of leisure, upon the ground that they will not take advantage of it for the objects which we have in view in claiming it for them. This is an assumption which we cannot but regard as gratuitous. There is no proof—for there has been no opportunity of giving any—that the assistants would not, to a very considerable extent, devote the leisure thus obtained for them to the performance of their domestic and social duties, to the improvement of their minds, and to the cultivation of their religious affections. On the *other* side, we fear that the case can be made out but too strongly. We fear that numbers of young people of both sexes are, by the evil workings of the present system of business, not only deprived of all opportunity of doing justice to their own nature, but thrown into the way of temptations, which act upon them with particular force from the irksomeness and sameness of the occupations which *make* their lives. If any one can imagine that this could have been the design and original ordination of things—that the counter can fulfil the destiny of the creature of God and the candidate for eternity—

we can only say, that we envy him not his belief, and that we derive some pleasure from our utter inability to share it. We wish, and we may add that we HOPE, to see the experiment tried. We would see the assistant set free to do justice to himself. If he then fails to realize the expectations we have formed for him, we must regret his misconduct, his blindness, his infatuation; but we cannot think that society has done more than a simple duty, in giving a human being the common advantages of humanity—a creature, formed and fitted for immortality, the opportunity of answering to his immortal trust.

But it is now high time to say a word of one or two of the publications which this movement has called forth. As far as our own knowledge extends, it has hitherto been a one-sided controversy—the opposing parties having confined themselves to newspaper letters, &c., without attempting any specific and deliberate exposure of the claims which they would set aside. This is a cause, indeed, in which the plaintiff is likely to have both the eloquence and the reason to himself. The defendant is left to make what he can of his ingenuity; and it is probable, that the most elaborate written defence of the system would prove a most valuable plea on the *other* side of the question. Meantime, we have many publications in advocacy of the projected reform. To the spirit of these (as far as our knowledge of them extends) we have already borne our willing testimony of praise. But the papers have also other merits to recommend them. They are written, for the most part, with manliness and simplicity; and some of them with no inconsiderable degree of elegance and vigour, of reach of knowledge and mastery of language. As one example of this, we would refer to the Prize Essay of Mr. Davies, published by the Metropolitan Drapers' Association, and introduced by a preface from the pen of the excellent Baptist Noel. The Essay considers the question in its relations to the three parties concerned in it—the employed, the employers, and the public. We subjoin the conclusion of this little work, heartily wishing that, by so doing, we could induce some of those whose example is influential, to look into the pamphlet itself, and *then*—to act upon the impression it shall have left upon them.

"The effects of this change would be beneficial to society at large.

"We have seen that its tendency would be to cause a great improvement in the health, intellect, and morals of a large number of persons of the middle classes, each one of whom will be a centre of influence for good or evil, and many of whom will hereafter be householders and employers. Now, by securing their improvement as individuals, we increase the probability that their influence will be exerted for *good* and

not for *evil*. As they will become wiser and better men, they will be more competent to discharge the responsibilities of a father and master; and thus the best interests of their children and servants will be promoted. They will become more fit to perform the duties of the several municipal or parochial offices which they may be called to sustain; and thus their townsmen and fellow-parishioners will be benefited. They will be better qualified to use their privileges as citizens and electors, and will therefore be more likely to use their votes and influence for the support of good government and the enactment of wise laws; and thus the welfare of a whole nation will be advanced. In short, the direct effects of this change would be to thin the ranks of ignorance and vice, and bring a reinforcement to those of knowledge and virtue. In this manner society would be benefited and receive new life-blood into its veins.

"Besides this good, another, less direct, would result to society, from adopting the change which we desire. If there be one bad feature in society at the present day which demands our attention more than any other, it is the all-absorbing spirit of business—of money-getting. Men are losing sight of the spiritual in the carnal, preferring the earthly to the heavenly, and treating that which is *temporal* as though it were of more value than that which is *eternal*. *Mammon* is the bloody *Juggernaut* of England, beneath whose chariot-wheels human life and human happiness are recklessly and cruelly cast. The system which has been exposed and condemned in these pages, is but *one* part of the monster evil which overspreads our land like some huge upas-tree, poisoning the very life of society. Destroy this system, and a blow will be dealt to everything which is akin to it; for every movement in the direction of what is *right*, is a movement down an inclined plane, increasing the velocity of the next. Put an end to the loud and just complaints of the assistant drapers, and we shall be more likely to hear and attend to the feeble yet more mournful cry of the thousands of *milliners* and *dress-makers* who are crushed by the same evil in another and a darker form. Other trades who suffer in the same manner as the drapers now do, will not be content till they have obtained a like deliverance. The spirit of rational reform will move upon the face of society, and who knows but what the result of that movement may be the overthrow of the despotism of the money-getting passion, and the establishment in its stead of the reign of benevolence and justice, 'of righteousness and peace?'

"And now, reader, if it be true, and surely it is, that the present system of *late hours* is baneful to the *body, mind,* and *spirit*; that it robs man of true happiness, dignity, and excellence; if, moreover, it be true that a curtailment of the hours of business will bring *disadvantages to none,* but *benefits to all,*—then every principle of *benevolence* and *self-interest* demands that you be willing and ready to assist in effecting a change.

"If you be a *customer* then, lady, we entreat you, by all the benevolence and gentleness of your nature, by your regard for the welfare and happiness of your fellow-creatures, by your love of virtue and hatred of vice, avoid and discountenance that which is the main support of this pernicious system, the practice of *shopping at night*. Let but all the

women of London abandon this practice, let them encourage those tradespeople who close their shops at a reasonable hour, and the cause we advocate is gained.

"If you be a *master*, then we beseech you, by the memory of that time when you yourself were an apprentice or an assistant, banish every prejudice in favour of long-established evils; give full play to the best feelings of your nature, and to the most enlightened views of your *duty* and *interest*; lend your sanction to the efforts which the assistants are now making, and avow your readiness to fall in with any reasonable arrangement for effecting their object.

"If you be an *assistant*, then suffer us to warn you against hindering the advancement of your own cause by dissolute conduct or licentious habits. Give, by a contrary course, the strongest proof that when you get *more* leisure you will use it well. Be alive to your own interests, be ready to support your Committee, and doubt not, if you be true to yourselves, success will eventually crown your efforts; for, as it has been said of truth, so it may be said of that which is morally *right*, '*it is great and will prevail.*'"—pp. 34—36.

We have also before us another interesting pamphlet, written by Mr. Flower of Liverpool, whose personal exertions in this direction have been characterized by that union of enthusiasm and discretion, which is so unfailing a talisman for success. His paper is modestly entitled, "A Glance at the Present System of Business;"—but it is a glance which could have been taken by no every-day observer. It is well and forcibly written, with that earnestness of language which betokens the fulness of the heart. We extract the following passage, as touching upon a topic of the most intense and tragical interest, and which, we are assured, if weighed by all as it should be, would give a momentum to the cause that would make it irresistible.

"There is yet another aspect in which the system of late hours remains to be viewed. It is one which exhibits that system as, in a great measure, the author and perpetuator of vices perhaps the most melancholy and disastrous of a vicious age—one which will strike home to the heart and conscience of every parent, of every brother, and of every Christian man; it especially shows how the vices hang upon one another—how insidiously they have wormed their way into the social constitution—how they are linked and confederated to destroy the happiness of mankind. It exhibits the sufferers as crying aloud from the wayside of misery for help, as craving the intercession of those men—and there are such—who seem to be lifted above the common lot by the Divine influences which appear to regulate their lives. * * *

"There are persons who contend that certain reformations are 'impossible,' *because* the evils in question form part and

parcel of a *system* involving the interests or arrangements of many classes of the people. For my own part, so far from viewing this *connexion* of abuses as matter for discouragement, I regard it only as a stronger incentive to exertion;—if the vices of the trading community are indeed a concatenation of injuries contrived and forged at the decree of Mammon to enslave the feeble and the friendless poor; and if, by meddling with any part of it, 'the whole system will be deranged,'—then, I say, we have a glorious incitement to pursue the labour which has been so well begun. In liberating the immediate objects of our care, we may perchance emancipate 'the million.' But to the point—to the case of the poor Dressmakers—the influence of their habits in encouraging late hours among shopkeepers, and the recoiling injury upon themselves.

"It is at, and after, the hour, when all shops *ought* to be closed—after fourteen hours of exhausting labour—when the 'sick head-ache' comes upon her—when the 'head swims'—when every object 'seems to dance before her eyes'—when she can no longer SEE the work she is employed upon—it is then that the poor female slave to a fashionable Dressmaker is *permitted* to 'take a walk for an hour;'—*after which her work is to be resumed*; and, to amuse her mind, while she rests her eyes, she is commissioned to make such purchases as can safely be made by gaslight. She is gaily dressed—young—and, perhaps, beautiful. Pleased with the liberty to breathe, even the air of night, she forgets her thraldom; she bounds along the streets with a somewhat flighty gait; the clouds of sorrow have been dispersed, and a ray of joy beams in her face. Her business leads her through the most public streets; her course is frequently arrested by the glittering attractions which the shops present; she determines not to purchase at the first nor at the second shop; but on she goes, amused with what she sees, and by the polite attention she receives. Possibly she visits five or six shops before her purchases are effected; and, by her single agency, an hour's labour may have been added to the day's work of the already toil-worn Assistants in each of those shops.*

"This is no exaggerated statement of the manner in which the cruelly oppressed Dressmaker, heedlessly and unknowingly, retaliates upon society the injuries which have been inflicted upon herself. But here the adventure does not end;—she is assailed by the wily blandishments of the professed Seducer—the Locust-Vampire, which always hovers about the shops at night, and is

* Upon a fair average, it may be assumed that fifty or sixty young men have thus incurred an increase of unnecessary attendance to the extent of an hour, through the thoughtless conduct of one person.

the veriest pest by which society is infested. The metropolis swarms with these pestiferous Insects:—they are, perhaps, one of the plagues which Heaven has sent upon us to prove that our sins carry about them the germ of their own punishment. The poor girl, as yet innocent and artless, fancies she has found a friend; she tells the secrets of her prison-house to one who seems to sympathize; she is soothed by soft words, and swelled with personal pride under the influence of flattery; she feels, indeed, that she is 'too good' to be submitted to the cruelties of her condition; she readily believes that anything short of starvation is better than her present lot. She does not fall at once; the gradations of her decline are systematic and defined. Discontent was already in her heart—but it is needless to trace the steps by which a fair, and innocent, and guileless girl is led into the depths of shameless infamy. The system of late hours among the shops, viewed in its diverse aspects, is indeed a *vicious* system. How much have they to answer for, who, knowing its vices, continue to uphold it!"—*Glance, &c.*, pp. 31—33.

The extent of the meditated change is thus briefly stated:—

"The reformation sought by the Assistants is, that in all retail trades there should be a uniform limitation of the time of attendance to TEN HOURS A DAY; and that the labour of the day should terminate so that every individual among the Assistants should be altogether released from his duties at SEVEN IN THE EVENING."—*Glance, &c.*, p. 43.

This is little to be sought or won, in view of the uses to be expected from it. We cannot think that such a boon will be long unaccorded. A spirit has been extensively awakened, which is favourable, and more than favourable, to the successful issue of this meritorious struggle. The steady prosecution of the object by the same means and in the same spirit will, we hope, end in the full and early attainment of all that is included in the change itself, or anticipated from its issues.

We will close our remarks upon this subject by extracting the chief part of a letter, which has been reprinted from a local paper, in the Third Annual Report of the Liverpool Association of Assistant Tradesmen. We can safely aver, that the views taken in this paper are, as nearly as possible, coincident with our own:—

"The evil which we now have in our common view does not appear to me the less, but the *more*, impressive and affecting, from the circumstance that they who are the victims of it, submit, or seem to submit, to it with such unfortunate apathy. It is no argument against the cause, that others feel more for

them than they, generally speaking, appear to do for themselves. We feel, at once, such reasoning would be unsound. Were it otherwise, how many a holy and glorious cause would not have had a banner raised, a trumpet sounded, or a blow struck on its behalf! Does it take from the urgent need of beneficent efforts among the poor, that the poor themselves are so generally unconscious of their own deepest wants, of the sources of their sufferings, and the means of relieving and removing them? Surely this is not the case. So far from it, all such efforts have a deeper interest for every generous mind, from a conviction that they are made for those who are insensible of the want of them, who are so much habituated to their depressed state that they have no idea of rising from it, but vegetate on, like weeds in stagnant waters, without a thought of exchanging their lot for any thing happier and better.

"That system should seem to stand in need of no lengthened exposure of it, as defective and wrong, which views any human being simply in the light of a *gain-maker* for his employer. This is the light in which the slaveholder views the slave. If so, it cannot be the light in which the high-minded man of business ought to contemplate the fellow-beings who assist him in carrying out his schemes of personal interest. His aggrandizement should not be based upon their degradation. His plans should not involve in them the loss or lowering of his fellow-creatures. Whatever involves such a principle must be wrong and hollow, unworthy of British freedom, and incompatible with Christian love. The Assistant Tradesman must be of the same human brotherhood with his employer. He has all his personal sensibilities; he has all his social impulses; he has all his domestic affections; he has all his capabilities and wants, as an intellectual, improveable, and responsible being. His destiny is not fulfilled, his claims are not responded to, when he is considered only as a breathing appendix to the counter, as a speaking and moving index of the places and prices of goods. If he does but this from morning to night, no justice can be done to the holiest needs of his being. His 'spirit' has been 'finely touched;' but where are its 'fine issues?' *So much for so much* is the abstract and history of his life. The Sabbath only is redeemed from this monotony of degradation. Of many observations that here suggest themselves, I will mention but one. I can scarcely think that the vassalage of the desk and counter is a meet preparation for the use of man's loftiest privileges, for the performance of his noblest duties, and the enjoyment of his most elevating pleasures. A

man had need to be more *his own* before he can properly give *himself* to God.

"How little can the poor assistant know of a *home*! He may be a husband and a parent. Alas, for him the more! He does not live for his wife and children, but for others. They know that he is alive, and where he is to be found. Is this all? Was it for this that these ties were contracted? How little can he know of what passes in his own dwelling! His children outgrow their most impressible years without his being able to take any personal share in their education. He stands little chance of knowing anything of their characters. They are to him as so many 'familiar strangers.' He knows how much destinies depend upon dispositions; but what influence can he be expected to have upon the dispositions of those who can only snatch a glimpse of him at morning and at evening? Is this right? Is this as it should be? I think not; but I am a cypher, without a unit in the cause; and this pen of mine is not the lever by which a far-spread and deeply-fixed evil can be lifted out of the onward path of society. Multitudes, I fear, must stumble upon it yet; but let us, at least, not cease to point it out, till we can get it heaved out of the way.

"I cannot doubt the *final* success of your ardent and generous endeavours. The rights in question are so clearly just and natural, that I reject, as a moral absurdity, the supposition of their being advocated in vain. This is, indeed, but what I feel in respect to everything that will be demonstrably a source of blessing to society. Convince me that a claim is just, that a principle is true, that a plan is beneficial, and you convince me, in the act of doing so, that it will make its way into light and power. I believe in the constant gravitation of the right and the true towards success, and of their ultimate repose in it. He who pursues a good end by good means appears to me to fight for it with a conquering talisman upon his sword.

"*Custom*, inveterate custom, is the great obstacle in your way. It has a threefold operation against you. The first respects the employers; the second, the employed; the third, the public. The employers, in numberless cases, will object to your attempted reformation, that they have been accustomed to it all their lives, as their fathers were before them, and that they cannot think it wrong to keep up the good old practice. The employed, the assistants themselves, have been so long habituated to the yoke, that it has marked its palsying pressure upon their characters. The public, immemorially used to exact attendance at all hours, will not readily admit the possibility of doing without the full liberty of the past. I believe that *all* will eventually

be benefited by the change. The employers will find that they are gainers in health and happiness, without losing in purse; the employed, that, without any detriment to their employers, they may improve themselves, attend to their families, and mingle with society; and the public, itself benefited by benefiting so many of its members, will be farther advantaged by learning new lessons of general thoughtfulness and forbearance, the effects of which will not cease with the occasion which produced them. It will be found, with some surprise, that business and happiness will go on, not with diminished, but increased momentum, though the shop may be shut when the day's fair work is over, and liberated thousands may enjoy the evening as *their own.*

"Much stress has been laid upon the expediency of this measure, as giving the assistant tradesman time and opportunity for the improvement of his own mind. To this it has been strongly objected, that the result is very unlikely to tally with such expectations; that, of the youths and young men now employed in our places of business, but a small minority indeed would make such a use of the opportunity, were it given them. I do not believe, in the first place, that this objection is well founded; and, in the next place, if it *were* more probable, I should revert to the principle itself, and say that the duty and desirableness of *giving* the opportunity, is not affected by any mere conjectures as to its use. If a right at all, there can be *no* right to withhold it, even admitting that it may be, in some respects, or for some time, a neglected blessing. *Some*, at any rate, will appreciate and employ it. They may, at first, be fewer than you could desire; but a torch will have been lit which nothing can extinguish, and which may well be trusted to fulfil its proper ministry, in spreading gradual light far and wide into society.

"I would it were in my power to add anything to the strength or interest of your cause. I rejoice to think those already engaged in it have no need of mine or of any other encouragement. They are too deeply convinced, both of its justice and of its utility, to require any outward incentives to patience and perseverance. Nothing more is necessary to success. Enough has already been done to give cheering promise of more. But success will summon you to a further duty, that of teaching the use of it. New demands will arise, to be met by new exertions. Fresh schemes of recreation and improvement must be projected and supported. It is a dangerous conjunction, that of liberty and ignorance. There must be institutions to prevent it. But this, I know, has already been in your contemplation; that it has, in part, already been attempted. If it has not yet suc-

ceeded to your wishes, perhaps the attempt was chargeable with some generous prematurity. I trust it will be resumed under more favourable auspices, and that, when the assistants are enabled, not only to exist, but to *live*, the means of discerning and appropriating the best wisdom of life will not be found wanting. I confess I should feel less interest in a reformation which was only to strike forth the fountain of liberty, without heeding in what direction its waters were to flow—whether they were to fertilize the field and valley in their course, or wander idly into the sands of the desert, this moment sparkling, and the next no more.

"'Man,' says the Scripture, 'goeth forth to his work and to his labour *until the evening*.' This is the wise and benign ordination of Providence. Who would wish to change it? There would be neither glory nor joy in an idle world. But there is a time for rest as well as for labour; and, in my idea of rest, I include something more than food and sleep. I have hinted at some occupations for the leisure we are advocating. The beautiful season reminds me of one not yet mentioned. I would set the assistants at liberty to see something more of the happy face of nature. I would have them know, from personal observation, that there are blue skies still over them and green fields around them. I would see them freshening their spirits amid the scenes of the brightening world. I would not that the sun should set for them unseen, but that they should always possess the power, and sometimes experience the joy, of seeing the day close in contagious beauty and peace, and the splendours burn and die upon the waters of the Mersey. These things are a part of our universal patrimony, as their influences should be of our common and constant education. They are not designed for the few, nor the many, but for all. Let us not abuse them by monopoly or exclusion. A crippled blessing is an active partial evil.

"Before I close these desultory thoughts, which sympathy calls forth for friendship to forgive, permit me to refer specifically to two classes of our fellow-beings to whose lot the *principle* upon which you are acting applies with peculiar and affecting force. I refer to the case of the Governess conjointly with that of the Dressmaker. Alas for them both! How many a young cheek has withered, how many a warm heart has been broken, under the secret hardships of those overwrought callings! Both these classes are largely composed of young females of refined habits and delicate organizations, whose energetic will to labour cannot call up the strength to make that labour uninjurious, and who gradually sink under the silent underminings of years.

Oh! that a word could be said for them where it might avail them. Oh! that they were less 'out of humanity's reach.' Oh! that Fashion would think, and pause in its dread exactions. A veil rests upon both these classes, the rending of which would make some fearful disclosures. It would be a heart-breaking martyrology. The gifted and the beautiful, the young, the kind, and the pure, how often would their names be found amongst the victims of those employments which, managed as they too often are, demand so much of life, that it is tantamount to demanding *death*. Will this always be? Can nothing be done to save them?"—*Report*, pp. 14—18.

With this we take leave of the subject, as of one which we hope to have no further occasion to recur to. It appears to us, we repeat it, that, with the advocates and resources it can now command, it needs but a continuance of the same earnest efforts, made in the same gentle yet manly spirit, to be, in a few years, among the mists that once hung dimmingly over society, but which the breezes will have totally dispersed, while the sunshine has settled into their room.

J. J.

ART. VI.—HUMAN NATURE. London: John Chapman. pp. 91. 8vo.

A MAN may be known, says the proverb, by the company he keeps; and a nation may be judged as correctly by the controversies in which it engages. An observer of the social aspect of England at the present time would easily remark the deep strong tide of religious feeling that has set in of late years, by attending to the theological disputations and practical spiritual problems which float, in their unwieldy bulk or fantastic forms, along the stream. There is indeed an under-current of benevolent sentiment, which every now and then evinces its existence by the philanthropic schemes and inquiries which are thrown up from amidst the heaving struggling masses of opinion; but the intellectual strength of the age is absorbed for the most part in theological dispute, not in the discussion of great vital principles, such as marked the first stages of the Reformation, when the main question at issue was one of life or death to the human soul. Unhappily for our spiritual prospects, there is in our country at present a marked absence of interest in grand momentous theological principles. The display of zeal takes place rather in an exaltation of 'the weak and beggarly elements' of bondage, in 'questions and strifes of words,' or 'perverse disputings' about matters which may once have been of importance, as an outward rind to the seed of truth; but which, like other husks, should never be fed on, while there is bread enough and to spare in our Father's house. Perhaps one of the worst evils arising from such a state of affairs is the necessity under which men capable of far better things find themselves, of spending their time and strength in demolishing the errors and repairing the mischief which result from the labours of those who have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge.

How far that necessity is real or apparent, how far the spiritual guides of the people ought to confine themselves to the development and establishment of Truth, leaving errors to die a natural death, is a practical problem that has greatly, though we think unnecessarily, perplexed the members of our own denomination in particular, both here and across the Atlantic. It is doubtless pleasant to wash our hands altogether of controversy; declaring that, for our part, instead of pulling our neighbour's house about his ears, we shall always build up, just in front of his own crazy tenement, the beautiful edifice of Truth, which it will be very hard if we cannot induce him to exchange for his

previous unscriptural and unhealthy abode. Partly, however, owing to the inherent obstinacy, we suppose, of human nature, partly to the fond associations which bind us to our early home, how mean or squalid soever it be, people do very often resist this hospitable mode of procedure, and refuse to quit those opinions which we believe to be a great obstacle to human progress, until they have been well nigh battered down by vigorous controversy. But while we admit that the necessity for controversy will never cease to exist so long as error remains in the world, and that it is often impossible to find a site on which to build up *positive* views, as they are termed, till we have made a considerable clearance, we ought to be deeply impressed with the obligation under which we all lie, either as givers or receivers of Opinion, of making our main object the discovery and propagation of grander, brighter, more profound, and thrilling views of God's eternal Truth. In the realms of Thought, as in the sphere of Virtue, we should ever be seeking after some higher thing. If the Tractarians are hard at work in one direction, and the lovers of Straussian myths in another, if between these two extreme poles of the Christian world an inconceivable amount of learning, labour, zeal, and theological acumen are squandered upon interminable discussions respecting 'personalities,' 'influences,' 'satisfaction,' 'milleniums,' 'regeneration,' 'unnecessary facts,' &c. &c., while the people meantime are perishing for lack of the bread which alone sustaineth, what a solemn call it is for men of might to come over and help us!—to lead the public mind to the fresh and untrodden fields of Thought, which extend boundlessly on every side. Here and there it is being done by one or two noble pioneers in different denominations, in a manner which clearly indicates the direction which the efforts of others should take. But it is not only leaders whom we require. The work of Diffusion is not less important than that of Discovery; nor can we expect a better condition of affairs in the religious world until the spiritual guides of the people in their various spheres of action are zealously co-operating with those who are fitted to lead the way in causing Religion to occupy that sovereign throne in the world of Thought and Action for which she is evidently destined by the Creator.

Let us take it for granted, without further preface, that, in the present day at all events, Religious Reformation, or (in the language of that excellent apostle of pure Christianity, Joseph Barker) Evangelical Reform, is greatly needed. Let us grant moreover that this necessity is, and always will be, periodical. Our duty in such case then is to assist in expounding the manner in which that Reform should be conducted.

The one great object which Religious Reformers must set before them is evidently to enthrone Religion as the supreme sovereign ruler over the thoughts and feelings of men;—to give her absolute dominion in the head and heart of society. The grand ambition of the Romish Church to exalt itself above the civil power, the indomitable energy and perseverance with which it asserted, and, with varying fortune, long maintained, the supremacy of the Spiritual over the Temporal authorities, was an emblem, though coarse and worldly, of the conflict which has to be carried on in all ages by the true servants of the Most High. They have to challenge, for what they believe to be pure and undefiled Religion, the sole undivided right of enunciating the great principles on which alone all practical rules and modes of action are to be founded; of constituting the only ultimate court of appeal in all questions that can arise between man and man; of deciding upon all claims to authority and influence over the temporal as well as spiritual interests of society; of directly or indirectly moving the various springs of thought and feeling which impel the world of humanity on its daily course. To establish Rights like these is no child's play, but a mighty work which requires, and receives, divine assistance. It is to be attempted, because it is God's will; and for the same reason, it is to be done. In the present day, as we have remarked, it is but very partially attempted, and, as a matter of course, but very slightly accomplished. The leading minds of the age are no doubt chiefly to blame. Not so much those of the present generation; for it necessarily takes a considerable time before great and stirring thoughts can descend from the heights where they originate and take firm hold upon society. The fault is more with those into whose labours we ought now to be entering. There are signs which give hope that our successors will have less reason for this complaint. Be it then the watchful care of the humble missionaries of Truth, which, more or less, every member of Christ's Church ought to be, that they fall not short of the work which others have given us to do: lest we fall short also of that rest which remaineth for the people of God.

The enterprise of giving to Religion her rightful and absolute sway over human affairs, naturally divides itself into two modes of action. First, to establish her influence over the Literature of our country,—over our speculative, didactic, and imaginative forms and expressions of Thought. Secondly, to bring her influence to bear directly wherever Practical measures are discussed and carried into effect.

Of the latter of these divisions, as we have least to say, we shall speak first. Synagogues, churches and pulpits have been

consecrated, since the promulgation of the Ten Commandments, to the work of urging religious obligation in practical affairs. None who allow that religion has any claims at all have ever disputed the propriety of such a mode of enforcing those claims, so long as they had reference only to the individual actions of each worshipper. Offence has often, of course, been given to individuals; but the great body of the laity have acknowledged the spiritual authority of the preacher. The grand contest has invariably taken place when the priesthood have endeavoured to enforce that authority against what they deemed the practical violation of Religion by temporal powers,—by the sinful proceedings of political bodies and public communities. In so far as the motives of the priesthood in this world-wide struggle have been pure from temporal ambition, their object was a most important one, and still ought to be as strenuously as ever aimed at by the Ministers of Religion in the nineteenth century. The interests of Religion are betrayed upon a gigantic scale, when her right to dominion over the counsels and measures of public bodies and civil authorities is passively abandoned. She suffers under the lamentable effects of such treason in all countries where it has worked its will, in every human heart even which is professedly and theoretically surrendered to her sovereign rule. Where men behold the great rules of morality and religion openly disregarded by Governments, and the standard of expediency or necessity substituted in national arrangements, there is inevitably a fearful encouragement given to laxity of principle in private life. But independently of the general injury to morality caused by such wholesale abandonment of God for the service of Mammon, there are no limits to be set to the injurious influences both on body and soul, especially of the poorer classes, caused by the political errors which Religion only could prevent or rectify. She must be enthroned in the Cabinet, and the Senate, as well as in the Prayer-meeting and the Sunday-school, before the kingdom of heaven can really come; and the ministers of the Gospel abandon her interests in those 'high places' at their serious peril. Had Luther been the bosom friend of Munzer, and their respective aims mutually permeated each other's soul, the temporal and spiritual welfare of Christ's Church would have received a far mightier impulse than the Reformation gave it. Christ himself never neglected the physical condition of his brethren, either in his practice or in his directions for entering upon life eternal. He made no distinctions between irreligion on a public or a private scale, except to give the greater sin the sterner condemnation. Neither have Christ's ministers any warranty for conniving at rebellion to his

authority on account of the magnitude of the treason, or the name it may bear. Looking at the general course of protestant ecclesiastical history, we can have no hesitation in believing that those ministers have exhibited a mournful laxity of conscience in regard to political sin. They seem hardly to have been aware that these two words could be united. The obstacles to a lofty independent course, in which they should have a single eye to their Master's honour and his full supremacy, have indeed been tremendous. Still we have nothing to do with obstacles in the cause of Christ, except to overcome them. Did God deliver up His Son for us all, that we should deliver up His kingdom to the servants of Mammon, through fear that He will not, with him, freely give us all the assistance we need? The great error into which the Ministers of the Gospel fall, when they 'wrestle against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places,' is not that of testing all proceedings by the words of Christ—this is their bounden and solemn duty. Their error has been that of descending from the lofty platform of God's judgments, to strive and jostle in the crowded arena of fallible human passions and opinions. They are elevated by the disciples who instal them as their spiritual teachers and reprovers, to a position from which their counsels, judgments, and rebukes, as the expounders of God's truth, will always be listened to by many with deference and respect, and from which they may put forth a moral power over society that can be limited only by their own character and strength. But when they leave that position by contending for measures or rules that rest only upon fallible human opinions, or by assuming in any way the character of a partizan, identifying themselves with a party instead of simply with principles, they abdicate the grandest and mightiest functions which man can discharge. They lose that respect which is essential to their influence. Their work is to bring their jealous, sensitive, worldly-minded fellow-creatures in all their concerns under the sovereign sway of Religion. Pride, passion, indolence, all the infirmities of human nature, oppose that sway, and how can they possibly establish it, if they themselves appear in ever so slight a degree to seek any other object, to acknowledge any other authority? Like Cæsar's wife they must be above suspicion, or their power withers away as the early blossom before a frosty gale. Few indeed can realize the perfect ideal of a Gospel minister, but all should aim at it. And when the clergy of modern time labour as strenuously but more consistently to bring temporal authorities into subjection to *practical* and *pure* Religion as the Roman

Catholic clergy of former ages strove to subject them to the Papal See, we may anticipate a great and hallowed change in the temporal welfare of nations, as well as in the spiritual condition of the individuals which compose them.

Leaving then the question of the political duties of the clergy in reference to Evangelical Reform, we must glance at the wide field in which they are called to labour by the Philanthropic movements of the day. If the establishment of genuine, Christian, Civil, and Religious Liberty, especially of Peace principles under all circumstances, form prominent features in the political reforms required by Religion, the duty to abstain from the drink which floods our country with pestilence and death, with ruin to body and soul, must be admitted to a foremost rank in the social reforms which she demands. Close in connection with these objects stands the deeply important one of Education in its highest as well as lowest sense.

It is not our purpose to enlarge upon these topics; simply to express an opinion as to the direction in which we believe good men and true will find the most efficient and permanent influences for effecting the object we suppose them to have deeply at heart. The Peace and Total Abstinence movements we regard as two great lines of railway, whereon the car of Religious Reform will travel safely and swiftly forward to those other spheres of Improvement and Change, at which, though more distant, it is most needful to arrive, with all speed.

We now return to what we described as the first division of the problem whereof we treat; viz., how to establish the influence of Religion permanent and supreme over our speculative, didactic, and imaginative modes and expressions of Thought.

Here is a large undertaking; its mere suggestion would seem to many to stamp it at once with the mark of extravagance and fanaticism. Or if it be understood in the sense in which it is proposed, the reply to the question, How is it to be accomplished? would probably be simply this,—Imbue all literary men, all philosophers and poets, with a vital spirit of Religion. True. This is very needful, but it is not exactly the solution, we think, which the problem requires. If Religion mean anything at all, it means everything. As time is to Eternity, so are all other interests to Preparation for another Life. That is, nothing at all; zero. Finite things can bear no proportion to those that are Infinite. The inference we draw is, that everything is just of no importance, absolutely without value, except according to the manner in which it affects our eternal existence, if such existence is to be ours. The believers in the so-called Orthodox scheme of Salvation have been deeply impressed

with this truth, from the clear unmistakeable manner in which their leaders have drawn the line between heaven and hell. Unitarian Christians have often mourned over the greater coolness and indifference manifested by their own body, resulting partly from the unconscious influence of their doctrine of Universal Restoration, from an "it-will-all-be-right-in-the-end" sort of feeling,—partly from the difficulty of bringing forcibly home to the Belief and Conscience that exactly-retributive hell, of reaping whatsoever we have sown, by which the word 'damnation' is interpreted in Unitarian Churches. But if every thought and action, nay every idle word, by their inevitable influence upon our character, as well as by their eternally indestructible nature, will most assuredly exert an eternal influence upon our destiny, we have a far more stringent claim upon the human race than our orthodox brethren with all their terrors. We cannot yield to them one jot in the urgency, in the solemn call, of the claims of Religion. But while under a sense of the infinite worthlessness of all mere earthly interests, they, when sincere, have generally flung far from them those interests, and endeavoured to concentrate the attention of mankind upon another world, our work is of a very different nature. If the great problem which we have referred to is to be solved at all, it must be done, not by contracting all forms of Thought and Action to fit a solitary Truth, however important, far less a puny shrivelled creed, but by giving the mighty Spirit of Religion free scope to issue from her prison-urn, and fill those forms to their utmost stretch. Every mode whereby the human mind has yet expressed its inward convictions and emotions—every means whereby the soul may be influenced, must, we do not say be made subservient to the extension and increase of the power of Religion but they must, exist for that purpose and for that alone. Philosophy, Science, Art, and Action, have one work to do in this world, and only one,—to prepare men for another. Surely 'there is but one thing needful,' if man shall live again. We would not say then that Evangelical Reform is to be carried forward by imbuing the thinking and writing minds of our country with vital Religion. This we take as a matter of course in relation to them, simply as *men*. We would rather say, endeavour to lead all men, whether they be authors or readers, to regard every separate means of influencing society as a holy vessel of the Lord, consecrated to His service, and to be used only to promote, directly or indirectly, His glory and the salvation of His children. We need not, we hope, stop to explain to readers who have been brought up in Westminster Assembly fashion (for we are not likely to have any), that we

believe Religion to be as capable of filling the merriest heart and the merriest tale, as the soul of the martyr and the song of the saint. It can dwell as freely and as holily in a 'Christmas Carol' as in a 'Paradise Lost.' But all are its rightful inheritance. Away with the usurpation that has so mournfully narrowed its domains!

We can conceive of no higher work, nor of a more promising field of labour, than that into which Unitarian Christians are invited to enter, by their present position and views; one in which moreover, unhappily, so few of other denominations, or of no denomination at all, appear willing to toil. Therefore while we are striving to make Religion omnipotent to comfort, guide, restrain, in the humblest paths of Thought and Life, we have especially to enthrone it in the highest. Great and life-giving Principles have to be developed from the inexhaustible stores of our Saviour's history and doctrine. New and varied forms of bestowing interest, power, grace and beauty upon Goodness and Truth, must be presented to the world. Hidden bonds of Union between the things that are seen and those that are unseen, symbols of the Spiritual and Eternal in the outward temporal system of Nature, stern and striking signs amid the silent admonitions of the Universe, these and similar revelations from God have to be interpreted to man not less zealously, and as frequently as His holy Word.

Unitarians more than any other body of Christians are specially called upon by the position they hold in the Religious world, and by the various privileges for which they are responsible, to wed Philosophy to Religion, and thus indefinitely exalt the character and the power of both. The banns too often and too long have been forbidden. Unitarians are unfettered by narrow, dark and deadening views of Creation, and it is for them, in time to come as in time past, to make all men feel that the question of Salvation is not a matter which is afar off from them, in a local heaven or a sulphureous hell, in arbitrary judgments or vicarious merits;—that it is not moreover a question merely for Bible or Sermon reading, for consideration only in the pulpit or the pew;—that it is allied with all these, and with all that is highest, noblest, most beautiful in our own souls and the Universe; but that it is also around our daily paths, interwoven with our every-day existence; bound up with all we do, say, or think,—*and will be for ever.* The celebrated sarcasm hurled at Unitarians under the title of "Every man his own Redeemer," pointed, like many other calumnies, in more ways than one to an important truth. Unitarians as individuals may often be too self-confident and presumptuous, but their views of Christianity have the surpassing merit of vindicating

almost alone, the essential doctrine of the Universe that Salvation "is within us" through Time and Eternity, and that by its indestructible constitution, the human soul in one deeply important sense is its own Saviour and its own Judge. In proportion as we faithfully work out these truths we shall promote Evangelical Reform and Everlasting Joy.

The little work whose title we have placed at the head of this article labours with zeal and success to display and enforce the connection which exists between the dictates of Religion and the system of the Universe, in reference specially to a practical point of vital interest. The author and his purpose therefore, we need not say, have our cordial sympathy. He is marching in the right direction. He has summoned Philosophy to a holy alliance with Religion, and though we differ from him in several of his conclusions, or rather perhaps in their mode of statement, we regard "Human Nature" as a valuable contribution to a cause which we ardently desire to see prospering.

The work consists of an Introductory Essay containing the author's leading ideas; the principal Essay entitled an Exposition of the Divine Institution of Reward and Punishment, wherein they are more fully developed; and some concluding "Ethical Observations" written during the perusal of Mr. Martineau's recent work.

The author having commenced by a just condemnation of the limited and dogmatic spirit wherein the subject of Religion has generally been handled, proceeds to state his own views of its nature and object. He defines it as "the science of human culture and development," and urges its great purpose to be the progressive unfolding and development of our Entire Being. Its object, he says, is "the Eduction (or Education) of the Soul from Unconsciousness to Consciousness." We do not imagine that Religion is a Science at all. Theology is, or ought to be; but Religion is a Principle. It is that principle in the soul which leads it to bind up its own existence with the being of God, and with all that God loves,—which assimilates, unites it to the Deity. It is neither a sentiment, a thought, nor a desire, alone; it is all these and something more, which we have no single word to express. But passing on to the main idea running through the work, we find it thus explained:—

"The greatest characteristic of a genuine comprehensive science of human nature,—of True Religion,—is the recognition that *being* is the greatest good, it is the one and only source whence happiness is derived, it is the designer and executor of every thing which exists."—pp. 12, 13.

And a little further on:—

"Assuming as an axiom that *being* is the greatest good, the antecedent and originator of all happiness," * * * *

And so on in various passages we find the author insisting upon "the supreme and infinite superiority of BEING," comprehending under this term "the physical, intellectual, and effective nature of man." From the view which he thus takes of Life or being, he infers that

"The very smallest degree of development, the very slightest increase of the capabilities or faculties constituting BEING, must necessarily be the thing most worthy our highest aspirations, and the greatest conceivable reward that could be bestowed for just action, or obedience to the divine laws as imprinted in our nature."—p. 28.

In the succeeding paragraphs he appears to intimate that by BEING he understands *perfect being*, or God's *being*; and that approximation to such perfect existence by the progressive development of those faculties and capabilities which imperfectly unfolded constitute our own being, is the grand purpose for which we are created, and the great reward of obedience to God's will. There is however a want of clearness in his use of the term Being. A ready assent would be given to the doctrine just expressed, so far as it goes, but when (*vid.* p. 27) he uses the term to signify merely *man's* nature, and in the other passages quoted, extols it as the *summum bonum*, without any restrictive or explanatory clauses, we are compelled to condemn his procedure as, to say the least of it, unphilosophical and obscure. It is evident that the term *Being* alone is insufficient to express any idea which merits moral approbation, or any object deserving moral effort to secure it. It signifies quantity only, without quality. Before we can admit that increase of Being is so desirable a result we must understand its moral nature. It is of course the necessary 'antecedent' and condition of all good, just as the soil is of the vegetable kingdom; but when we have got our plot of ground, the question of its value still has to be determined by the nature of the plants or weeds that may be found to grow there. Further on, however, he speaks out more explicitly, but his meaning, as afterwards explained, should have been found nearer the commencement of a work having considerable philosophical pretensions. The passage we refer to is the following:—

"Or, in other words, if God be infinite in power, wisdom, and goodness, and consequently perfect in happiness; the greatest absolute suffering of which man is capable, will consist in a gradual extinction of those

faculties and attributes which, in their fulness of perfection, distinguish and pre-eminently constitute the character of the Creator, in a deadly decession or dying from God."—p. 29.

We must infer from these and similar passages that our author regards the never-ending development of all that is God-like in human nature as the greatest conceivable good,—a cessation of that development, and final extinction of those divine faculties as the greatest of imaginable evils. Sufficient stress is not laid perhaps on the necessity of such development of our nature being so conducted that the lower faculties should be unfolded in due subordination to the higher, and that harmony preserved between them, the want of which is a chief source of human suffering and sin. But as a general statement of man's rightful destiny it should be at once admitted. And yet something more is required before this important topic is placed in a satisfactory light. It is not sufficient for instance to say that a man's feelings of veneration are to be stimulated and quickened into more vigorous life, if that portion of his nature has hitherto lain dormant. You require that a suitable object for their exercise should be presented. The Imaginative faculties may be unfolded into vigorous life only to lay hold of impure or morbid fancies. Mere development, or mere harmonious development of our various powers, excellent and godlike though they be, is not sufficient to ensure approximation to God and Perfection, without another element in the process. In a word, we cannot confine our attention in considering the perfection either of God or His creatures, merely to their own individual nature. What then is the element we require? Evidently the nature of their relations to the external world.

The simple existence or "being" whereon our author dwells so fully, of venerative, loving, imaginative, or combative faculties, how vigorous and intense soever may be their existence, tells only half a tale. We require to know of such a person *what* he worships, loves, imagines, or opposes, before we pronounce him blessed.

And yet the word 'Life' is used alone, far more frequently than any other, by the Great Revealer of God's will, Jesus of Nazareth, as well as by his apostles, to express that ineffable boon which he came to confer as the greatest that man could receive. It implies, therefore, of course, infinitely more than mere existence.

But we must not now pursue this interesting subject. It deserves an article to itself, and for want of time and space we must leave it for the present, and return to the views which our

Author deduces from the immeasurable value he justly places upon Life in its highest and fullest sense.

"The primal Law or condition of Life," he observes (p. 31), "is Action." Hence decrease of Action or activity, is a proportionate decrease of Life—an approximation to Death. All our faculties, physical, mental and moral, illustrate this truth. According as they are (judiciously) exercised, their power and capabilities augment; "while disobedience and neglect of the conditions instituted for their development" brings with it a penalty proportionate to the crime. "In other words, the sin of inaction will be punished by absolute decrease and death of the sentient and perceptive Being." But there is one faculty given to Man which is very much misunderstood, and here we find its true nature ably explained. We mean the capacity of suffering Pain. Pain, he complains, is too generally regarded as a punishment—as a retributive penalty for disobedience to the Will of God. He argues that it should be viewed rather as a faithful watchman calling aloud to warn us of impending danger which threatens some portion of our nature with decrease of vitality and ultimate death. If we burn our finger, the destruction of the living tissue, not the feeling of pain, is the real penalty; if we commit wilful sin, the pangs of conscience are God's blessed instruments for warning us against actions that must bring with them an infinitely greater evil than pain, viz., spiritual death. This all-important doctrine that Pain is not the grand evil from which men have to flee, as alas! both in their preaching and practice they generally declare it to be, is brought out with much force and clearness. Pain is but the friendly monitor of approaching danger and existing evil. Never did society more require to be taught this doctrine than in the present cowardly age,—an age in which, from the effeminacy of their training, men shrink from suffering as the one great evil to be dreaded in this world and the next, while, on the other hand, Pleasure, Ease, Enjoyment, under the more dignified title of Happiness, is held out, by the preaching alike of philosophers and divines, as the great object for which they are to scramble! We sincerely thank the author of "Human Nature" for his able assistance in exposing this ignoble and pernicious fallacy, and earnestly recommend his lucubrations thereon to all who have been trained to view Pain as an Enemy, instead of as a mighty Friend. Men's idea of Heaven, as he truly remarks, is generally the antipodes of their notion of Hell; and if the latter consists in mere corporeal suffering, the former will be 'a Celestial Lubberland' of mere sensual delights.

But there is one error into which we conceive he has himself

fallen, which is too serious to be passed by. Decrease of vitality, ultimate death,—these, he says, constitute the true punishment of disobedience to the will of God, not the pain which precedes them. Is not this phraseology forcibly sanctioning the pernicious view too often taken of Punishment, which makes it nothing more than Vengeance? Loss of vitality and power is indeed the mournful *consequence* of inaction and disobedience, but surely God's *punishments* are always corrective. The pain which ensues upon all transgression when first committed, the pangs of remorse, and all the miseries which men suffer through sin here and hereafter, can we believe that they have any other object than to purify and reform the sinner? We consider that the scorpion lash of Conscience, the Hell of agony in which he is plunged, should far more fitly be denominated the *Punishment* of sin, than the extinction of vitality, which, doing nothing to reform, can only be viewed as its fearful consequence; and hence we differ totally from the criticism on the terribly graphic extract from Mr. Martineau's volume, prefixed to this Essay, and to which it appears to owe its origin. But to return.

Having pointed out how the excellent capacities for usefulness and enjoyment, with which we are endowed, shrink and wither away if they are left unemployed, the capacity for suffering pain is shown to follow this general law. If we will not heed the admonitions of pain when we violate the physical or moral laws of our being, its voice becomes fainter, and the nerves which have often been exposed, for instance, to the action of heat, and the conscience which has frequently been seared by the consciousness of sin, at length cease to inflict pain, when these injuries are perpetrated. "Nature as well as Christ," he truly observes, "declareth that she will not have her talents 'hidden in the earth.' For unto all those who do so, the voice of eternal justice crieth, 'Take therefore the talent from him, and give it unto him that hath ten talents; for unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance; but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath.'" Here are most useful thoughts finely illustrated, and the whole of these passages are deserving careful attention. We are too ready to forget that there are grievous sins of inaction, of omission, as well as of commission, and if we can but escape positive suffering, we hug ourselves in the belief that no harm is happening to us. The most terrible fact connected with sin is the indifference, the gradual unconsciousness of danger and evil which it induces. And while the soul is slowly losing one after another all its glorious prerogatives and gifts, while it is gradually destroying its titledeeds to a heavenly inheritance, there may be

peace and joy, such as they are, within, and all be going "merry as a marriage bell."

The question here, however, may naturally be asked, Is this fatal indifference always preceded by the warning voice of Pain? Do not thousands and millions slide into habits of guilty negligence and apathy, without one pang to tell them of the doom they are incurring? We reply, no:—not if they were aware of their guilt, if their sin was wilful. But they may have had no means of becoming aware of their guilt. True. 'And yet they must suffer the loss of the precious talents, which they thus ignorantly bury in the earth. Is this just?' Just! what has justice to do with punishment? It is the old fallacy, and our author is falling into it here again (p. 49) when he urges that Remorse cannot be regarded as the punishment of sin, otherwise "the manifestations of Divine Justice would be irreconcileable with human reason, for we see that its pangs decrease as habits of sin increase. It appears difficult to the mind to realise the truth, (in spite of all the Unitarians' labours,) that God never punishes to satisfy Justice, but that all pain is either monitory or corrective;* and that Hell itself with all its fearful horrors is the place or state wherein the sinful suffer purifying pain. From a too exclusive consideration of pain in the light of admonition, the Author seems to give himself up to the idea of annihilation as the inevitable final result of obstinate sin. But believing that Pain in the great economy of the Universe has a function to perform, not less benevolent than that of preventing sin, viz., to reclaim from it when committed, we would fain believe also that in another world the sensibility to its pangs, which the hardened conscience has forfeited here, may be again awakened. Is it not evident that acute suffering may be endured long after the first sensibility of conscience has been destroyed? Let a man be deprived of all the means of indulgence whereby he had polluted and debased his spiritual nature, and the anguish he would suffer might work in him gradually a blessed change. It is so occasionally in the prisons of earth. Why not also in those of Hell? If his guilt has consisted in criminal apathy and indolence, let him behold and clearly understand the misery he has thereby caused to others, or which he might have prevented; and Remorse, in another world, as well as in this, may yet restore him to Life and Love Eternal. It appears to us necessary that these notions should be followed out to make the work before us complete. But the general

* By this we do not mean that it does not also serve the purpose of a warning to others as well as to the sinner; but we cannot believe with our orthodox brethren that it is ever inflicted simply *in terrorem*.

question of total annihilation falls more properly within the scope of the observations we propose to make at some future time on the nature of life.

It must, however, be evident that when the process of moral disease has been for some time continuing, so that the seared conscience can no longer perform its functions of preventing and reclaiming from sin, an entire change of circumstances can alone prevent total spiritual death from supervening. That change will, in all probability, take place in another world, and the conscience be once more awakened from its deadly lethargy by the soul's beholding in succession and detail the wide-spreading and appalling *consequences* of former sin. The deprivation of all former means of vicious gratification or of indolent indulgence, would form a powerful machinery for arresting the progress of disease, and for once again quickening spiritual life in the soul through the agency of suffering and pain.

But we must bring these desultory remarks to a close. The general view which ought to be taken of the whole question of pain, punishment, retribution, and death, appears to us to be simply this: that here we are in the Universe, with the Lord God who made it; if we grow and live in harmony with the principles on which it is created, we shall gradually attain to infinite and eternal good. But as those principles are perfect like their Originator, they will not be altered one jot or tittle, and we must adjust ourselves to them, or suffer the consequences. If the suffering we endure from contravening them, brings us gradually into constantly increasing harmony with God and His Universe, well; but all revelation, both of His word and works, points to the conclusion that nothing can permanently exist in a condition which jars against the mighty wheel of Creation, *against the nature of God.* The Deity may bear long with it for purposes of the grandest benevolence, but surely it must at length, like a dead carcase, be resolved back into its original elements, to rise again in other forms of life and beauty.

The Essay we have been reviewing concludes in an eloquent on-looking strain of thought, which forms a fit sequel to the interesting views the Author has previously developed. There is not, and, indeed, cannot be, too much emphasis laid upon the great and solemn truth of the power which God has given to Man over his own destiny, but we would rather have seen some slight recognition, at least, of the need in which we at the same time stand, of constant help from on high in working out that destiny for ourselves.

A review of the Ethical Observations contained in the latter part of the Volume would compel us to enter on discussion *de*

omnibus rebus et quibusdam aliis, and want of space compels us therefore to leave them to the numerous readers, who we hope will peruse the work, with the remark that though sometimes a little mystical, paradoxical, and here and there, according to our notions, untrue, they are very suggestive, requiring and deserving much of that philosophical consideration to which we have already alluded as a part of the special mission of the Unitarian denomination.

There is a statement, however, in p. 72, against which, in the form it there wears, we must enter a decided protest. It is said that from the 'progressive nature of the soul,' through 'its successive, gradual, but SURE unfoldings and development,' 'it must, of necessity, have given utterance to those truths and revelations of the nature of the soul which we now possess under the name of Christianity, so soon as any other mind had reached that state of development and advance in psychical progression which Jesus exhibited.' These words appear to imply that some other mind must have reached 'that state of development' in the ordinary course of human affairs, even had not Jesus attained to it previously. Granting that it is now possible, (since Jesus *has* lived and taught,) though not probable, that any other human beings might attain to his mental and moral development in *this* world, we cannot also grant that they could have done so by any possibility, had not such a being as Jesus existed, with the accompanying circumstances as recorded in sacred writ. We believe that an attentive examination of the condition of the world at the time of his appearance, and its subsequent history, prove, incontestibly, that his divine mission was an essential link in the progress of humanity, without which moral death would gradually have swallowed up the spiritual life of man, and that, in such case, the progress of the human race would have been as effectually stopped as that of a branch which withers on being severed from the vine.

Here then we take our leave of the Author and his book, and, with the abatement of a certain air of pretension to originality, for which there is no just claim, commend his labours to the attentive perusal of those who are, and those who ought to be, Searchers after Truth.

Art. VII.—DISSENTERS' CHAPELS BILL.

The slight impression made upon the Legislature by the vehement hostility manifested against this Bill, has confirmed us in an opinion which we have long entertained; that, amid an apparent retreat of all sects and churches towards the rigorous doctrine and credulous superstitions of an earlier age, there is a real advance in the secular feeling of justice, and an enlarging knowledge of the true doctrine of civil rights. The firm refusal of the Government, on several recent occasions, to place itself at the disposal of ecclesiastical ambition and religious zeal, is an indication that these social (or unsocial) forces are not so considerable as their showy and noisy character might lead us to imagine. We hold it to be impossible that, in direct contrast with the ignoble and intolerant agitation out of doors, the high-toned and brilliant debate on the second reading should have taken place within the House, if the sound-minded and steady portion of the people, the portion whose character constitutes the element of permanence in any community, were not known to be unaffected by the theological passions raging around them, and to retain a settled attachment to religious peace and freedom. The debate had but one fault,—the absence of any respectable speech on the wrong side; a circumstance which might have been employed as an excuse for giving a tame support to the measure, and for treating the unpopular persons who are the first to benefit by it with epithets of cautious repudiation and cold disdain. But instead of this, the leading men of every class seemed emulous to yield it the aid of their advocacy; the Lawyer, to attest its accordance with statutory analogy; the Jurist, its agreement with the experience of nations and the philosophy of law; the Man of Letters, its consistency with the modern theory of Christianity; the admirer of "Church principles" and student of Church antiquity, the sound basis of its historical assumptions; the once oppressed Catholic, its claims on a country which was retracing its persecuting steps; the Statesman of enlarged expediency, its propriety as a measure of peace; and the constitutional Whig, its manifest necessity as an appendix to former and imperfect charters of religious Liberty. And so far from any ungenerous advantage being taken of the smallness of the party immediately benefitted, it was evidently felt to be a becoming duty in the Legislature to protect the weak and quiet against the strong and angry, and to reprove, by the dignity and firmness of its own

discussions, the rancorous language which atones by present insult for defeated opportunities of future injury.

As our readers must be familiar, from the public journals and other sources, with the general features of the Bill, and the proceedings which have brought it to its present stage, we shall not advert to the details of the controversy respecting it; but endeavour to present some of the general principles by which, in our apprehension, it ought to be judged.

Of all the difficulties connected with the institution of property, the greatest arises from the circumstance, that while the most valued *objects of possession* are permanent, the *possessors themselves* are transient. Land and even buildings remain from century to century; while men who call these their own, vanish and are speedily replaced during the same period. The relation of owner to property is one of lordship and control; but in human affairs *permanence* is so vast an element of *power*, that where durability is on the side, not of the possessor but of the possessed, there is danger of the relation being inverted, and the *thing* establishing a despotism over the *person*. How are the two terms of this relation to be preserved in mutual adjustment? How is the evanescence of the one to be accommodated to the stability of the other? And at the juncture between two generations, what is to become of the objects coeval with both, and sure to be appropriated by both?

Two extreme methods of meeting this difficulty are evidently open to us. We may impart to the property the transiency of its owner's power; or we may invest the owner's power with the permanence of the property. The former may be done, not, of course, by annihilating the *object possessed* with its possessor,—(burying the war-horse with the warrior,)—but by withdrawing it from appropriation, and making it open to acquisition again; so that each generation should begin its earnings *de novo*, and have command over nothing but its personal gains. We are not aware that any attempt has been made to carry out this idea, except by the followers of St. Simon, who proposed to vest the fee-simple of all property in the State, and to allow to those whose labour and skill created new wealth or attracted old, only a life-interest in their accumulations. The alternative course may be carried out in any community sufficiently advanced to have the art of writing; the owner's living power and mind cannot be detained; but where the means of recordation exist, its wishes may be registered ere they are extinct, and the symbols denoting them be handed down, and renewed in perpetuity. In this way his personal removal does not withdraw the influence of his ideas; his voluntary agency obtains a control over gene-

rations to whom he is not present; and he gives a suffrage age after age in human affairs of which he is not cognizant.

It is needless to say that this last is the method to which the law of all civilized countries inclines. More or less power is every where given to the recorded will of a former possessor. It could scarcely be otherwise indeed, seeing that the usages and laws of nations are constituted for the most part by the creators and holders of wealth, who naturally desire to prolong their control over it to the latest possible moment. And the practice is not destitute of rational grounds of support. There is the most obvious difficulty in finding any better means of disposal of lapsed ownership. There is the certainty that the proprietor occupies the position from which the best view can be obtained of the proper use and destination of his wealth. And there is the least selfish and most powerful of all incentives to production, where a man is enabled to render his industry beneficial to his children and his friends.

This general theory however is necessarily limited by numerous practical difficulties. It assumes that a possessor has sufficient foresight of what will happen when he is gone, to define what his wishes would be, if he were present. The vast amount of fiction involved in such assumption must be evident to any living man who will examine what passes through his mind when he forms a judgment on a matter of business, and reflects how few of the real elements of his decision were within the apprehension of any dead man. Still, in a world governed by fixed laws, *something* may be known or rationally expected beforehand; and in whatever direction nature opens a man's view into the future, the law pushes his rights over it; checking his power only where Providence has denied him light to use it.

Thus, in property destined for private use and gratification, he may fairly presume that there will be, within certain family degrees, definable persons to enjoy it; but he cannot foresee the peculiar ways in which they may best enjoy it. The contingencies of human succession lie within assignable bounds, which do not baffle expression; but the varieties of human wishes, and the shifting opportunities of human pleasure, are beyond all computation and description. Accordingly, in relation to his private property, it is permitted to a man to say *who* shall have it, but not *how* they shall spend and use it.

In other cases, these conditions are reversed. There are *purposes and uses* which present the appearance of *permanence*, and seem capable of being reckoned on through all time; while the individuals who will administer them will be ever changing and can be only indistinctly seen. The continuance of civil

government, and of spiritual wants among men, is felt to be so little doubtful, that the *State* and the *Church* are regarded as imperishable institutions; though the particular persons successively occupying them may be wholly indiscernible. Hence, in relation to any portion of his property which he may wish to make public, it is permitted to a man to say what *purpose* it shall serve, but not, except by general or corporate designation, *who* shall use it.

This system cannot be worked, in the complicated relations of established societies, without great limitations; and the tendency of experience is to subject the rights of men over the future to narrower and narrower conditions. The power is granted to them in every case on the assumption that, to the extent of its exercise, they can foresee, and are therefore qualified to provide. If it should turn out that they *cannot*, the assumption falls to the ground, the condition of the grant fails, and the concession becomes void. In the transmission of private property this may arise from many obvious causes. The succession may be doubtful, marriages illegal, families extinct; parties who should be at hand to take up their rights may be absent in a foreign land; legal instruments may be informally executed, fraudulently produced, or heedlessly mislaid. Finding that in various ways, inheritance is apt to fall into unintended hands, the state will come under no absolute engagement to testators to do their will, but imposes both on them and on those whom they would benefit certain *obligations* as the conditions of its protection. To the testator it says, you must *foresee* what you would have done, and you must *expressly define* it according to a prescribed form. To his beneficiaries it says, you must *look* after your rights, and give timely information if anybody invades them. If you neglect these obligations, we cannot pretend to protect you. Thus arises the great rule of prescriptive right; which rests on the two facts:—That *lapse of time* puts evidence out of reach, and leaves only an inferential and speculative title to be recovered against an actual holder long undisturbed;—and, that *custom* has a serious effect on human happiness that ought to be respected; so that when one person has, from uncontested occupancy, acquired the feelings, sentiments, and expectations of a possessor, and another, from unconsciousness of any supposed right, has found a natural place in a different lot, their relative positions should not lightly be reversed, because a dead man's wish has been unexpectedly dug up.

The case is little less strong in the instance of public property. Corporate succession is not indeed doubtful, like

family lineage, so that this particular cause of uncertainty is removed. But the power of bequest is liable to the same obligations on the part of both the parties interested in its exercise. And it is a just rule of law, that if the persons endowed by a trust go to sleep and forget their claims, they will find, when they wake, that their rights are forfeited. It is manifestly reasonable that men who want to be protected in certain privileges should give notice, some time before the world's end, that their privileges have suffered injury. Hence, under the counsel of Sir Geo. Saville, the legislature of this country contravened the ancient maxim of law, *Nullum tempus occurrit regi*; and, at the instigation of Lord Tenterden, repealed the corresponding rule, *Nullum tempus occurrit ecclesiæ.* And now it stands acknowledged as a universal principle, that you may *lose the tide* in the affairs of men.

Thus far, however, we have referred only to *extrinsic* limitations of the power of bequest and endowment; limitations imposed in consideration of the several intervening accidents that may arise between the donor's act and some future period of its administration. They may be all escaped by compliance, on the part of those who are interested, with certain reasonable obligations; and they leave intact the general doctrine that the donor's will ought to rule. We venture to go further; and to affirm that experience and reason alike show the necessity of *intrinsic* limitations on the right of bequest itself; that even with the best intentions a man may not "do what he likes with his own;" that it would be a monstrous anomaly in a living world, were his lonely wish, long sunk in darkness, to be allowed paramount sway, '*perpetuum lucis mansura per ævum.*' There is always a tendency in the human mind to overrate the stability of *customary* things; and to suppose that the currents of change on which objects sweep past it cannot affect the very seas themselves in which it lies fast moored through life. And it is not surprising that, in ages of national re-organization and growth, marked by every species of disorder that can introduce insecurity into private life, the sceptre and the crozier should appear the only objects certain to abide. It was plain there must always be a *chief strength* and a *chief sanctity*; and in the wildest uproar of the social elements, when individual interests were whiffed hither and thither in the most helpless way, it was seen that in point of fact, royalty was the indestructible head of the confusion, and that the church reposed tranquilly in the midst, hearing the tempest of secular violence sweep by. This external phenomenon coincided, in the impression it would produce, with the conception, natural to a simple and unre-

flective age, of religious truth as a substantive, permanent, immutable reality, partaking of the eternal sameness of God. It was inevitable that a time occupied with such a history and such a faith, should be prolific in endowments of a church never shaken, and a creed never denied. The Reformation has since instructed the world by a *new* experience; has shown that it is necessary to distinguish between the enduring and the transient elements of faith; has made it evident that some things, dear to the heart of one generation, may become worthless to other times; and that purposes, in spirit good for ever, may in form and expression assume a character of evanescence. Auricular confession, the eucharistic sacrifice, the magical power of the sacraments, were disengaged from the system of which they had formed a part: and above all, the doctrine of purgatory, and masses for the dead, which had specially attracted the pious gifts of earlier generations, and embodied themselves in gold, became estranged from the received scheme of Christianity; involving in the removal of the idea, an alienation of the wealth. A new conception of religious truth has thus taken occupancy of men's minds; as having indeed substantive reality in itself, that is real objects and relations corresponding to its representations in human thought;—only *infinite* in its scope and nature, and therefore ever partially seen, open to new views, and, in reference to man, progressive without end. Whether this capacity of development is referred, as by the older protestant divines, to the *Bible itself*, as an unworked mine of divine wisdom, ("'Tis a broad land of wealth *unknown*,") or, as is more agreeable to modern modes of thought, to the *human mind* as an ever-changing subject, looking through new media from age to age, is immaterial for our present purpose. The fact, however conceived, remains; that, while religion is constant, particular combinations of thought become detached from it, and others attached to it. There is therefore a partial unsoundness in the fundamental assumption itself, on which the whole right of testators rests; and to the extent of that unsoundness the right relapses to society, which conceded it in its inexperienced years only under conditions which are now found to fail. The state may say; "We always supposed, in granting you this privilege, that the use to which you wished to dedicate your money would in itself *last*; this postulate was the silent substratum of our mutual understanding. We never meant to offer you the power of propping up a thing that should prove to have no perennial root in nature, and become as a dead trunk upon the earth; but only of taking your choice among the things which God *does* make permanent, and attach-

ing your efforts to this or that of the perpetuities of nature. We cannot undertake to affirm for you, a thing to which Providence says No."

Thus no man can, without the grossest absurdity, be permitted to endow the articles of his personal creed, under expectation of their being protected by the state *in sæcula sæculorum.* If, with the egotism of a belief unconscious of its narrowness, he employs phrases descriptive of his transitory thought, not the world's enduring faith, these must share the fate of his perishable individuality. The state must draw its pen through the particular terms, and substitute the nearest general ones. The will of the founder, if too stringent, ought to be set aside; and no dead man's purse continue to be used as a bribe to living men's convictions. So in point of fact has the legislature of this country long ago decided; not even waiting till the endowed creed had become extinct, but acting on the first hint that there was in it a principle of decay: and while Roman Catholicism was only *not the strongest* element in the religion of England, so that there was no difficulty in finding qualified recipients of its funds, these funds were transferred to the support of a younger faith unconvicted of decrepitude. Only on such condition can you prevent a breathing, thinking, speaking world from being ruled by the cold, marble images of a motionless and silent one, whose errors are incorrigible, and whose wisdom barred from increase. We are not disposed to commit ourselves against the principle of endowments altogether; past generations leave us many of their debts, let them be permitted to hand us some of their money too; but only on the rational understanding that we as well as they are to have a suffrage in the precise appropriation; and that fathers shall not disown their children as partners in their charity.

By these principles all legislative acts relating to foundations ought, in our opinion, to be tried. The present Bill stops far short of them; and whatever imperfection it has arises from this circumstance. Perhaps it was needless however to resort to them in their utmost extent in a measure having so limited an object as this; and discreeter, in the temper of the times, to work out the desired practical result by methods more secure from the objections of the timid. The immediate purpose of the Bill is to quiet persons of Unitarian persuasion, in the occupancy of chapels and connected properties, established originally by persons of presumed Trinitarian sentiments, and in times when Unitarianism was proscribed by law. The present holders have been disturbed on the plea, that they were excluded from the intent of the founders. This exclusion, which, it is acknow-

ledged, is not express but only implicit, is inferred in two ways; 1st, from the state of the law at the period when the chapels were built, and especially from provisions of the Toleration Act; which (it is said) by treating Unitarianism as legally "intolerable," cleared it entirely out of the imagination of founders, as a possibility to be guarded against at all, and saved them the trouble of defining this part of their design; and, 2ndly, from the state of theological belief among the English Presbyterians of that period; which shows that they deemed a reception of the doctrine of the Trinity an essential condition of Church communion, and would have protected their chapels from the approach of Unitarianism, had they thought it necessary. Both these grounds of inference the present Bill removes; the first clause removes the former, by putting away into total oblivion all anti-doctrinal laws now repealed, and forbidding any use of them in the reading of deeds and wills; the second clause removes the latter, by shutting out all other inferential evidence of intent,—allowing every thing which the express terms of trust do not prohibit; and, in case of disputes arising within the range of this allowance, settling them by reference to the usage of the twenty-five years immediately preceding the suit. Let us try this measure by the principles which have been laid down.

There are three parties here, whose rights the legislature touches; the founders of the chapels; the holders of them; the claimants of them. There is a question to settle between the founders and the holders; and another between the holders and the claimants. How should the state, and how does the state, propose to determine these two controversies?

As to the first of these, the allegation is, that the founders' rights have been violated. They had a right to consecrate their property to any public purpose they chose, and to impose upon trustees the obligation in perpetuity of seeing that this purpose was attained. They chose to create chapels for the exclusive use of Trinitarians. The trustees have let in Unitarians, and are chargeable with breach of trust.

Now we do not hesitate to say that, even if the founders had meant to endow their own personal creed and had plainly said so, this would have been a very proper occasion for the state to interpose and say, "We must put a stop to this; abstruse matters of theological belief, on which there is no consent among the best and most thoughtful men of any one generation, much less between successive and distant generations, are not proper objects of endowment. Belief in them cannot be regarded as a public service, like healing the sick, and training the orphan, and is no fit qualification for having disposal of pro-

perty rescued from private enjoyment for social uses. People may endow a chapel, if they please, as they may endow an hospital, an asylum, or a school; but if they clog the chapel property with their particular creed, they must expect the consequences which would happen, if in the hospital were enjoined the use of no remedies but tar-water and inoculation,—to the asylum were attached rules for casting out devils,—and the school was restricted in its books of instruction to the vocabulary of Papias and the arithmetic of Capella. Zealous men always feel confident that their personal notions are sure to become universal and to prove imperishable; and, with this idea, nothing is more natural than that they should deem them suitable conditions of their benefactions: but it is our business to look at the assumptions of one generation by help of the experience of many; and finding this idea to be a manifest error, we cannot undertake to treat as perpetuities a class of interests to which nature has given but a life-tenure of the world."—This answer, we think, would have been just and reasonable, in perfect harmony with the only principle on which the right of endowment can be defended at all; and not less in accordance with the precedents established at the period of the Reformation. The holders, screened behind such a defence, would have had a title precisely similar to that of the established church to Cardinal College or York Minster.

The state, however, has taken lower ground. It has not committed itself to any denial of the founders' right to annex a creed, of any degree of minuteness, to their benefactions. Nor is this at all necessary. Grant this right to the utmost: it is still a *conditional* right. Founders may have the *privilege* of endowing a belief; but then they must comply with the obligation of *saying what the belief is*. This the founders in question have not done; and the privilege of indulging a doctrinal intent is forfeited by the omission. It is not reasonable in persons who will not take the trouble to explain their own wish, to call upon the public authorities to see that it is administered, and at an enormous cost of labour and money to burrow through the subterranean passages of history to recover that which the most trivial pains, bestowed at the right time, might have left conspicuous in the light. And observe, this necessity of working, through the silence of the founders, to a speculative intent, is imposed by the complainants, not on the courts of law alone, to which such investigations are sufficiently onerous, but on *every individual trustee* of every open trust. Because they have not stopped the first encroachment of opinions different from those first preached in the chapels, the trustees are accused of malversation, of "spoliation," of "gross violation of

their solemn engagements," and of displaying "the cunning craftiness of seducing deceivers." Well then, what is it that they were bound to do? To administer the will of the founder. But where are they to find this? Where look for their instructions? Not, it is admitted, in the deed or document prepared for their guidance; for, as far as this goes, they have kept all right. No, they are to find out the personal and heart belief of an individual who has been in his grave for half a century, of whom public history is entirely silent, and private records, if there are any, are scanty, and heaven knows where; who "kept himself to himself" with Presbyterian discretion, and lived at a time whose secret history was notoriously at variance, to an unusual extent, with its open professions. You impose this task, whose labour would exhaust an antiquary, and whose nicety baffle a casuist,—on whom? Mr. A. the country surgeon; Mr. B. the prosperous haberdasher; Mr. C. the retired chandler; the worthy chief men of the ancient congregation in a small market town. Is it really then their bounden duty to rake together the theological gossip of obscure biographies, and import it into the deed as a test, thus presuming to close a trust which had been left open? And is it further their duty to carry this test in their thoughts, whenever they go to their place of worship; and Sunday after Sunday to try by its light, or its gloom, the varying shades of pulpit phraseology; and to raise an alarm, and throw its peaceful congregation into a Babel of contention, the moment the orthodoxies, new and old, appear to be a questionable match? Either the trustees ought to do all this, and to be removed for not doing it; or the founders ought to have said plainly what they wanted, and to be put out of court for not saying it. Even if they meant to perpetuate a creed, they have not complied with the conditions under which alone the state engages to protect them in such an act.

But *they never meant it.* The historical evidence, the leading points of which were stated with masterly force and precision in Mr. Gladstone's speech on the second reading, is so clear and conclusive on this head, that, if all antecedent decisions could be got rid of, if only the knowledge collected during the Hewley case could be preserved, and its prejudices and partialities dismissed, if there were no future influences to be guarded against, disturbing to the evenness of the judicial mind, we should be content without any alteration of the existing law. It is probable that the courts themselves will be very glad not to have to repeat the decisions, to which they have unfortunately become committed.

For our own part, we cordially wish that the evidence were

less strong than it is, of the prevalence of latitudinarian sentiments and dislike of creeds at the end of the seventeenth and commencement of the eighteenth century; for the sentiments were certainly disowned, and the creeds openly professed with an emphasis very unsuitable to the state of mind then prevailing among the English Presbyterians. They are not a class of men, for whom, at that period of their history, we can profess to feel a high admiration. We think it impossible for any one to read attentively the opposite historical statements and proofs of the two parties in the Hewley suit, still more impossible for him to imbue his mind by thorough study with the whole spirit of the Toleration period, without discerning traces of an extensive prevalence of insincerity, courtliness, and indirectness, in the character of the Presbyterian divines. When we read, for instance, in Mr. Joshua Wilson's recent pamphlet,* that Dr. Calamy, looking upon subscription to the doctrinal Articles as not involving assent to the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian creed, used these words, "I here give it him under my hand, that had I not been satisfied as to that, *nothing would have prevailed with me to have subscribed that* (the eighth) Article;" and again, "I hope you will not think *I subscribed in my sleep*;" and when we remember that this Dr. Calamy *confessed in private that he had never subscribed the articles at all*,—we are led to hope that the "degenerate descendants" of such men, if they have lost in orthodoxy have gained in honesty, and though they "may understand all mysteries" less, have a truer love of the simplicity of Christ. If such a man as Calamy could resort to language thus evasive, we cannot be surprised at the statement of a contemporary, who, from entertaining scruples about subscription himself, was curious and diligent in ascertaining the real state of mind among those who complied: "that most who had taken them [the Articles] were sneaks and shuffles, thinking they had given the world full satisfaction for abusing it once very solemnly, by resolving they would not do so a second time. In short I found that after all the pretences to honour and conscience which Dissenters talked so much of, a man was fully forgiven for being a rogue to promote his interests; and if he was more scrupulous than his neighbours, it was thought an effect of pride and vanity."† With facts and statements like these before us, it becomes a plain rule of evi-

* English Presbyterian Chapels proved to have been orthodox Foundations appropriated to Trinitarian worship and the Preaching of Trinitarian Doctrines: by Joshua Wilson, Esq., of the Inner Temple.

† Memoirs of Himself, by Mr. John Fox. Monthly Repository, vol. xvi. p. 134. This has reference to the year 1712.

dence in reading the history of that age, that all professions of Conformity and sound doctrine are to be received with caution and allowance, as given under temptation to overstatement; while every indication of theological wavering and declension from imposed standards of orthodoxy must be interpreted *in majus*, as symptomatic of a state of thought which, even with a wide extension, would scantily creep out into the light. We are therefore but little impressed with the citations, of very orthodox sound, adduced to prove that the English Presbyterians of the Toleration period had no regard for private judgment in religion, except within the limits of a creed like their own. We presume that the strongest of them are to be found in Mr. Wilson's pamphlet just published; and though, as we shall show, they are presented there in a manner more ingenious than ingenuous, they palpably fail to make out his case. A large class of them go to prove that the Presbyterian ministers professed assent to the doctrinal Articles of the Church of England: so did Calamy, and evaded signature; so did Baxter, and signed under protest; so did many who signed with notorious reservations; so did more, doubtless, who deemed it agreeable to their consciences to perform an act that did but put them into the same class with Tillotson and Clarke. The history of that period cannot be read without great misapprehension by one who fails to observe the relative position, handed down from the previous age, of the Church, the Presbyterians, and the Independents. All originally the same in their general views of the scheme of Christianity, the Episcopalians and Presbyterians had concurred in their approbation of *some* scheme of ecclesiastical government and an established Church; the Independents alone objecting to any connection with the civil power which should unite separate congregations into a corporate system. The overthrow of prelacy and the death of Laud, threw open the parochial churches to the Puritans, and for many years the Presbyterian ministers were accustomed to the duties and enjoyed the privileges of a national clergy. When the restoration took place, and it became evident that a State church with a uniform discipline would be revived, the Independents were the only people necessarily adverse to the change, and the Presbyterians might look to it with hope as opening a way to the fulfilment of their desire to have a consistent national administration of religion. The Act of Uniformity disappointed them, by introducing, in their view, the *wrong* administration. But they had acquired the feelings of parish clergymen, and declined with extreme reluctance to comply with the terms of the Act; they left behind them many of their brethren and friends, who viewed the matter

in a different light, and retained their situations; they were ready to go back, the moment they could gain attention to their scruples from a government of better temper. In this state of mind, they continued, keeping up the rights of their ordination by "not ceasing to teach and preach;" regarding themselves as qualified candidates for church offices on the first relaxation of the law, and barred out by coercion only; and hoping for some scheme of *comprehension* which might put an end to their wanderings on the outskirts of the fold. Having thus to so great an extent the feelings and sentiments of churchmen, they were anxious to show how small a plea there was for excluding them; to keep attention fixed on the fact that they were within a fraction of entire concurrence with the admitted clergy; to satisfy men's minds that they did not want a new basis, but only an enlarged basis, for the religious system of their country; and to explain that they did not wish to disengage themselves from the general Church, so as to set up what was technically called a "heresy," that is, a sect founded on individual notions irrespective of Catholic consent. This order of tastes and feelings maintained the Presbyterians, far into the eighteenth century, in close sympathy with the Church, and more and more detached them from the Independents. Their ministers exchanged friendly offices, and maintained close personal intimacies, with the Established clergy. Their course of academical education was similar to that of the Universities; a common theological literature pervaded the two bodies; and any new labourer in the field of biblical research, any fresh form of doubt or opinion, was welcomed with a similar curiosity, and scrutinized with similar feelings, by both. Hence, their histories remarkably illustrate each other, running in fact a completely parallel course. It may be confidently presumed that the period of low Arminianism and Arianism in the Church was the period of its prevalence, naturally under great concealment, among the Presbyterians; that the sense put upon subscription in the Church was not more strict than that in which it was construed among the Presbyterians. Turning to the period in question with these thoughts, we discern, in all the protestations about reception of the articles, and "not differing in fundamentals," and turning the back upon heresies, only so many ways of saying to the Church, "We are really the same as you; whatever you can sign, we shall not refuse:" and what this might mean in an age when Tillotson, the friend of Firmin, was Primate, and Hoadly and Burnet, Bishops, and Dr. Samuel Clarke in high repute, we need not pause to explain. But we *must* pause to point out a quotation of Mr. Wilson's, in which he has perhaps himself

overlooked, and certainly contrived that his readers shall overlook, the peculiar and *proper* meaning of the word "heresy" explained above; and by this and other means given an entirely false impression of a passage of Matthew Henry's Sermon on the dedication of the Chester Chapel. Mr. Wilson gives it thus:—

"Those that build altars for the maintaining and propagating any heresy . . . spoil the acceptableness of the altars they build, and it will be construed to be done in transgression against the Lord.——I bless God I know not of any that exhibit so high a charge against us, as that we have done it in rebellion, or in transgression against the Lord."—p. 28.

And he adds this among other comments:—

"Against the present occupiers of this building, the "high charge" may be justly exhibited and clearly proved, of having betrayed the trust handed down to them, by the admission of heresy, and of having done it in rebellion and in transgression against JEHOVAH, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, to whose honour this altar was erected and solemnly consecrated."—p. 30.

Now it is plain, from the whole strain of the discourse, that in disclaiming "heresy," the preacher intended to repudiate the charge of *division from the Established Church*,—the very thing, be it observed, with which the Independents were undoubtedly chargeable. The very next sentence conveys his meaning in something more of *lay* language:—

"We also are Israelites, in common, and therefore in communion, with those of the National Establishment."

But we wonder whether those mysterious little dots, indicative of a break in the passage, excite the reader's curiosity, as they did ours? We will supply the words, omitted, no doubt, from *too* judicious a regard for brevity:—

"Those that build altars for the maintaining and propagating any heresy, or the promoting and carrying on any design against religion in the power of it, that build altars to *support a monopoly of the Church*, and *engross to themselves its privileges, to the exclusion of others*, spoil the acceptableness of the altars they build; and it will be construed to be done in transgression against the Lord: if we bestow all our goods in building temples and altars, and *have not charity*, the reigning love of God and our neighbour in our hearts, all the cost is thrown away, and spent in vain, and we are but as sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal; and shall be dealt with as rebels against the Lord."—pp. 13, 14.

We will take the further liberty of presenting *the whole* of another passage in the same Sermon, of which Mr. Wilson has

quoted only the *last* sentence, joining it, without any mark of omission, with a paragraph to which it does not belong:—

"We are far from engrossing religion and the church to ourselves and those of our own way, or thinking that we are the only elect people of God; from our hearts we abhor and renounce all such narrow principles as are contrary to Catholick Christianity, and undermine and straiten its sure and large foundations. We do here solemnly profess, and shall take all occasions to repeat it, that we celebrate our religious assemblies 'in communion with all that in every place call on the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours.'"—p. 16.

If Mr. Wilson interprets Scripture on the principles by which he expounds Matthew Henry, we can readily account both for the soundness of his orthodoxy, and for his quick scent of "the cunning craftiness of seducing deceivers."

Another class of passages produced by this author exhibits the strong terms in which some of the eminent Presbyterian divines denounced Anti-trinitarian opinions. And truly the "Scold's Dictionary" could furnish no choicer specimens of rancorous speech than those which receive his pious approbation. We do not say whether they prove his point or not: but sure we are that, if they do, they prove a good deal more. Baxter classed Unitarianism with "false and dangerous doctrines;" and Watson said that it "overthrew man's salvation:" what then?—why, no chapels can ever be used in common by Baxter's denomination and that which holds these offenders. Good: but then, in 1697, Mr. Nathaniel Mather, an Independent, declared that Dr. Williams, a Presbyterian, "held soul-destroying errors;" therefore no chapels of the Presbyterians can ever be fit for the worship of Independents. Dr. Bates, again, called the Unitarians "Anti-christian;" so he must have wished to guard his pulpit from their desecration. Yes, but in the same sentence we learn that Dr. Carpenter said the Trinity was "Anti-christian;" did he then desire to fence his chapel with a creed? Nathaniel Taylor calls the Unitarians "modern infidels;" and could he belong to the same sect with them? Perhaps not: only about three months ago Mr. David Lloyd designated a certain book not a year old as "Deism Modernized;" and both the critic and the author are living Unitarian ministers. Surely it requires little acquaintance with the style of theological controversy to understand the estimate in which these established courtesies of divines are to be held. Nor is it immaterial to remember the *rapidity* with which theological changes were going on at the period in question. We have seen a solemn declaration of belief in the Trinity to which

Lardner was a partner, only a few years before he became the leading Unitarian of his age. And one of Mr. Wilson's grand authorities is Dr. Watts, who died in the faith of the very heretics he had denounced.

But it does not follow, from any strength of personal belief, that the wish existed to bind successors, or even contemporaries, to the profession of the same belief. All doubt on this point is completely set at rest by the celebrated Salter's Hall Meeting in 1719; at which it was decided by the representatives of the collective Dissenters (Independent and Presbyterian) that no declaration of belief in the Trinity should be required of Nonconformist ministers. This solitary fact (of which Mr. Wilson is prudently silent) we take to be conclusive as to the historical part of this question. There can be no plea for imposing on us, in the name of our ancestors, a test which they themselves, after protracted and solemn counsel together, would neither submit to, nor demand of others. This resolve, be it remembered, was not adopted in any blind reliance, which there was as yet no experience to correct, on the security of orthodox belief. On the contrary, it was the deliberate answer given in by them to the tidings, "The Unitarian heresy is among you; taints your academies, and spreads through your churches: will you not guard your gates, and bar its further encroachments out?" The reply is a perfect charter of religious freedom: "The Bible is ever on the watch, and will surely look to it: that which the living word does not exclude from the mind, we dare not hinder by force upon the will, lest perchance we be found fighting against God." Whether this decision was an entirely disinterested allowance of liberty by men of high dogmatic faith to weaker brethren whom they would win and not coerce, or whether it was recommended in part by secret, perhaps almost unconscious, sympathy with the offending Arians, it may be difficult to determine. For our own parts, we discern throughout the history of that time every symptom of a trembling orthodoxy; maintained among the Presbyterians less by living conviction than by their entanglement with the professions and sentiments of a previous age,—by the legal tenure on which they held their toleration,—and by the scope which struggling Reason had opened *within* the Church standards for any range between Tritheism and Sabellianism. Some of the statements of Trinitarian doctrine adduced by Mr. Wilson as "orthodox" savour strongly of Wallis's meaning of the word *Persona*; especially that of Mr. Clark, in which "the Persons" are said to be distinguished less plainly by their personal properties than by "the *different parts they act* in the economy of

man's redemption." The very eagerness, and we may add pompousness, with which, as Mr. Wilson will have it, the Presbyterian ministers repeatedly "cleared themselves" from "the horrid errors alleged against" them, their "keen resentment and sensitive shrinking from the insinuation" of "heretical pravity," are, we confess, in our perverse way of viewing these things, very significant indications of at least a wavering state of mind. These vehement expressions betray the last passionate effort of the mind to avert a danger which was becoming imminent: and the shaken, tremulous heart within tries to recover itself by paroxysms of protestation. Who and *where*, we would know, were these terrible Socinians, said to be so alarmingly numerous in those days, and to be every where spreading the taint of their opinions? Within the precincts of *what sect* were they found? If in the Church alone, why so much excitement on the subject among the Dissenters? and if in the Nonconformist body, *which division* of that body sheltered such dangerous guests with least reluctance? Why do we find the Independents in the seat of the accuser, and the poor Presbyterians, who were so *very* innocent and so *very* orthodox, uniformly put upon their defence? Mr. Wilson must admit that his ancestors were really exceedingly hard upon their unoffending brethren of the new Lecture. The dilemma is as inevitable as it is melancholy; if Salter's Hall resounded with the true faith, Pinner's Hall re-echoed with false slanders.

We repeat then that if the Presbyterian founders had meant to endow a creed and had said so, the State should not give its sanction to such a wish. But even if the abstract right were conceded, it implies a corresponding obligation, which in the present instance has not been fulfilled, viz. that the founder shall *state* his wish. We further contend, however, that this omission is not to be understood as carelessly forfeiting a right which the founder was desirous of exercising; but as a deliberate abstinence from all claim or intent to use it.

Very few words will suffice to dismiss the question of right between the present holders and the present claimants. Whoever may be *within* the intent of the founders, one thing is certain, that the Independents are *out of it*. They may, as any one else might, take upon themselves the part of *informers* against the occupants, and hope for the satisfaction of witnessing their ejection; but beyond this negative result, they can have no further reasonable interest, except such as all men have in the prospect of a scramble. We have seen on what railing terms the two denominations stood with each other at the end of the seventeenth century. And is it credible that two orders

of men, who, when living, could not possibly support a common lectureship, and meet at the same altar, should die with purposes of mutual endowment?—that Dr. Williams, e. g. expelled as Mr. Wilson admits, with insult and calumny from the pulpit he had adorned, and driven with his friends to create and dedicate a new church, should leave his benefactions to his slanderers? —that, of two parties whom no negociation, no "articles of peace," no presence of enemies, no expostulations of friends, could hold together in "happy union" for three years, the one should be the proper and natural representative of the other, and heir to all its foundations? We are satisfied that rather than rest in so wonderful a conclusion, judicial ingenuity would have to explore the whole of our English Christendom for a more hopeful claimant, until litigation perish of inanition. And is it not plain, that if the claim of these parties were ever so good, the time is passed when it could be justly preferred? They have neglected the obligation which the state must impose on all, as a condition for the enjoyment of such rights,—"You must look after them betimes, and let us know when anything goes wrong." These persons have for seventy or a hundred years forborne all complaint. They have allowed generations of the heretical dead to be buried with their fathers, the faithless among the faithful. They have stood by through the dawn of the educational period of the last and present century, and seen the school-house of the "blasphemer" rise by the chapel of the "saint." They have waited in patience, while the fund of the widow, and the provision for the orphan, grew around the place of prayer. They have remained passive, while the rude conventicles crumbled away and were abandoned, and structures with something of higher art arose, and the penurious precentor was exchanged for the rich organ and cultivated choir. They have accepted without murmur the aid, and we may fairly say, the *lead* of their "unbelieving" neighbours in the long struggles which have achieved the victory of religious liberty. And now, they stretch forth their capacious hand over the accretions of a century, and mildly say, "All this is ours!" Can any just man deny that it is becoming in the legislature to interpose and say, "No, it is too late for this?"

The case, then, of vindication of the principle of this Bill, is complete. In its details we think there is an imperfection well deserving the attention of those whom it is intended to benefit. The imperfection was pointed out by Lord Sandon on the second reading, but gained little attention. Should any person in a congregation legally challenge an existing doctrine or prac-

tice, the usage of the previous twenty-five years is to determine its admission or exclusion. It is obvious that the power thus given might be used by watchful complainants to prevent all future changes in opinion or worship; and to bar for ever that openness as to inquiry and teaching, on the allowance of which in the past the present holders rest their reply to the allegations against their title. The clause in fact seems to create a creed of usage, in default of a creed of trust; and to supply by an historical test the absence of a dogmatical test. We lament the existence of this feature in the Bill. We think, however that, should it still remain when the Bill has become law, it will be in the power of congregations to prevent, by timely precaution, any future evil that might arise from it. The "usage" spoken of refers, not merely to "doctrines," but to "mode of worship:" and perhaps this phrase may be understood to embrace, not simply the external practices relating to the offering of devotion, but any *principle* pervading the constitution and affecting the government of the congregation; such as the concession of free teaching to the Minister, the avoidance of creeds and confessions, and the custom of settling differences either by a majority of the Society for the time being, or in any other recognised way. Whether the "usage," as limited by the Bill to the two particulars of "religious doctrines or opinions," and "mode of worship," would be construed to include all this, we entertain some doubt: but we think the chance of so comprehensive an interpretation would be greatly increased, if congregations were *now*, each in its own way and for its own governance, to *write down* its usage in these respects, as a record or declaratory act against future sources of doubt and vexation. A court, we think, would be unwilling hereafter to impose a twenty-five years' creed in the face of a document, bearing date 1844, stating that the Society made it a rule to have no creed. We throw out the suggestion for the consideration of those whom it nearly concerns: but we fear that the blindness and incredulity as to future consequences, which almost always attends the acquisition of immediate relief, will stand in the way of its adoption. We should rejoice to believe that the danger to which it refers is purely imaginary.

Art. VIII.—NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

I. Walter Bernard. A Wesleyan Methodist's Inquiries as to the Object of the Sufferings of Christ. Second Edition. London: 1844. pp. 80.

This belongs to a class of religious publications which have been less frequent in the Unitarian than in other Denominations. Trinitarian writers have long aimed at presenting religious emotions and embodying religious controversies in lively narratives of the experiences, inquiries, and conflicts of individual minds. The interest of the story contributes to fix attention, and often touches more closely actual states of thought and anxiety, as they are felt in real life. Jotham Anderson by Henry Ware is an excellent example of the discussion of religious and scriptural doubts in conjunction with the interest of incidents and the delineations of character.

'Walter Bernard' is a very successful instance of this kind of religious publication. It exhibits in description and dialogue the troubled passage of a young Methodist, in the humbler ranks of life, from the heated atmosphere of Methodist doctrine and discipline to the peace and cheerful satisfaction, both to mind and spirit, of pure and simple views of the Gospel. The first revolt of nature and reason against vindictive views of God's character and government,—the struggle between the new doubt and the old reverence for orthodox representations—the coldness and anger of former associates in worship and deeds of Christian beneficence—the long process of painful scriptural investigation—and the clear and good deliverance at last, are all depicted with much tenderness, and sound knowledge of human nature. The difficulties discussed chiefly relate to the efficacy of the sufferings and death of Christ,—and the import of the scriptural expressions on these subjects is fully examined. The work, in short, is an instructive and effective popular Tract on the Doctrine of the Atonement,—and we hope it will escape the notice of none of our Societies which aim at the diffusion of purer views of the Gospel through the circulation of small and cheap publications. The discussion may perhaps be unnecessarily prolonged, and a little too much Greek introduced,—but those already persuaded are not altogether the best judges of what is *enough* in such discussions,—

and we are quite willing to take the Author's testimony respecting the degree of familiarity with Greek which is common with Wesleyan local preachers.

Walter Bernard, when enlightened and converted himself, felt his obligation to bring his new views before his former associates. The occasion is thus opened:—

"It was rather more than a twelvemonth after the opening events of this narrative, on a lovely evening in the height of summer, that a considerable concourse of people were to be seen moving towards the little valley which had been the favourite haunt of the Wesleyan teacher in his mental struggles and resolute inquiries. And in the midst of these, surrounded by a few attached friends, he now went forth with the multitude whom he had invited to listen to his first public address on the great topics that had long been agitating his soul.

"It was a trial of no ordinary severity. The cross was even heavier, when he came to bear it, than he had apprehended; for it was not only the natural fear of man that oppressed him;—he trembled lest the truths he held so precious should suffer in his hands, and he knew that it was an unsympathising audience he had undertaken to address. His countenance was pale, and his lips were silent. But in his heart there was that high and resolute determination which springs from an invincible faith, and which never fails to carry him who hath it, through the hardest trial and the darkest hour."

The sermon is on the application of Christ's sorrows and sufferings to the spiritual redemption of those, who seek to perfect their nature by meeting God's needful discipline in the spirit of the 'Captain of our salvation.' It is an admirable popular address to those who, without being resolute against inquiry, have strong affinities with the Trinitarian views of atonement. The close of the discourse, though necessarily wanting the close scriptural interpretations of the former part of the work, is a good specimen of the general manner of the whole.

"Yes, Jesus hath once suffered for sins; the just for the unjust, and oh! would that men understood that he died, not to satisfy JUSTICE,—but LOVE; to satisfy the promptings of his own and his Father's surpassing love, that men might also learn to love, and, instead of requiring satisfaction for injuries, follow in his steps. If he died to enable God to spare us eternal torments, how could he be an example to us, how could we partake of his sufferings? Alas! I know too well that until Christians understand this vast, this unutterably important distinction, misery, cruelty and sin never will cease from the earth. While they believe that Jesus died that God might have full satisfaction for the trespasses of men, men will feel themselves justified in requiring satisfaction for the trespasses of one another; they will be merciful in the way that they believe their Heavenly Father has been merciful to them. But when they

begin to see that their Saviour suffered to show them that they must not resist evil with evil, but overcome it by divinest love, when they have learnt that they must cheerfully bear the sufferings of others, that it is only by enduring pain and toil, ingratitude, injustice, privation and woe, that it is only, in short, by sharing the suffering which is ever caused by sin, that they can ever hope to remove sin, and save others from grief and pain—then, and then only, will they become like Christ, and prepared to dwell with him hereafter—then, and not before, will they have learnt the true nature of the reconciliation, the at-one-ment which God sent Jesus to effect. When they *practise* this lesson, then, and not before, will the fair earth we live on become free from cruelty, suffering, and hate; and most assuredly, not till then can we expect or desire that our falsely called Christian country should succeed in spreading her doctrines through barbarous and heathen lands. The pagan idolaters and savage tribes of other shores will scarcely learn the great doctrine of Christianity, to love one another, to overcome evil with good, from a creed which has far too much the appearance of painting an innocent son propitiating by his agonies the wrath of a vindictive Father.

"Oh! come to us and give us the right hand of fellowship! join us in our efforts to establish this higher, truer, and brighter view of the meaning of the Sacrifice of Christ. Let all men be made to feel that he died as an *example*, not as a satisfaction for our sins. Let those near and dear to you be made to feel this in the sanctuary of home. Let your fellow-townsmen feel it as you mingle with them in social life,—let your fellow-countrymen, yea, let all within the reach of your influence, (and God only knows how far that influence may extend,) let all be impressed by your precepts and example with the glorious truths which the death of Christ teaches. Thus, according to the talents given unto us, we shall each and all aid in bearing away the sin of the world, in showing how evil is to be conquered and sin is to be overcome, not by punishment, not by retaliation, but by enduring, forgiving, self-sacrificing, and at length triumphant love! God grant that his blessing may rest on these feeble words of mine, leading you to meditate upon them, and to act upon your own deliberate honest convictions as you must answer for it before the judgment seat of Christ! Amen. Let us pray.

"While Walter was speaking, the deepest silence pervaded the assembled multitude; but when the short prayer with which he finished was concluded, the murmur of many voices in earnest disputation rose upon the stillness of the evening air. Several crowded round him, as if anxious to address him, or to 'hear further on the matter.' But Walter, now that the excitement was passed, overcome by the conflicting emotions that agitated his mind, had seated himself on the rock which formed his pulpit, and covering his face with his hands, heard neither the anxious questions, the angry expostulations, nor the affectionate greetings of those around. Suddenly, silence fell upon all. On looking up, he beheld an old grey-headed man,—loved and respected throughout the neighbourhood, alike for his wisdom, piety, and benevolence,—raising his hand to obtain silence, and then advancing towards him. The venerable patriarch looked at him a few moments and said, 'Young man, I shall die happier

for having heard you, and I thank my God that He has spared me to this day. Do you see yonder clouds parting away to the light of the setting sun? even so are the dark clouds of error now dispersing, with which I have striven in my own soul through life, which I have seen hanging heavily over the souls of my brethren—and happy they whose sky is cleared in their earlier days. But your latter end, young man, will be bright and peaceful like yonder scene, for you will live and die in Christ. You will have many and sore trials, but your latter end will be peace. And,' continued the old man solemnly, though in a tremulous voice, after a short pause, lifting up his eyes to heaven, 'I believe, humbly, my prayers will be fulfilled, and that through the unspeakable mercy and love of our Father in Heaven, we shall meet above. Amen. Having put your hand to the plough, you will not turn back. God be with you—Farewell.'

"Walter Bernard was not the only one of the friends around him in whose eyes stood a tear, while they returned the aged disciple's parting salutation; but he felt that the storms which had tossed his spirit when he first seated himself on that rock, and for many a day since, were at length hushed to rest, and his soul had found its peace.

"And day by day he felt himself 'strengthened with might in the inner man,' and he 'preached the word boldly,' and the number of those who hearkened to him gradually multiplied. 'Christ dwelt in the hearts,' both of preacher and hearers by faith, and being 'rooted and grounded in love,' they knew more and more of 'the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge,' and did their humble part, in their day and generation, to make that love effectual in the world."

II. A Sermon on Flowers. By Rev. Robert E. B. Maclellan. London: 1844.

Flowers cannot be thought an unsuitable subject for a Sermon by those who remember the words: 'Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin; and yet I say unto you that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. Wherefore if God so clothe the grass of the field, which today is, and tomorrow is cast into the oven, shall He not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith.' Yet there is a difference between a passing allusion for the purpose of illustration, a touch of truth and beauty, and the erection of the illustration into an independent theme. We are inclined to think that the most effective pulpit use of Flowers would be not to preach *upon them*, but to weave them into many a preaching touching God's love, and the spiritual aspects of creation, and the indications of future glory which the Creator hath given here. Far from us, however, be the rejection, or the cold acceptance, of such a theme, and we must think well

of any mind that is so forcibly moved by these finer traces of spiritual grace and power, as to feel it good to communicate its thoughts and suggestions to others. A severe taste may feel some want of simplicity in this discourse. A Sermon on Flowers ought especially to have been preserved from exposure to the slighting imputation of *floweriness*. The treatment should redeem the theme from all association with finery or sentimentality. We cannot say that this has quite been effected in the present case. Neither is the language at all times simple enough for the subject. 'An *unweeting* brother,'—'the *angulated* lightning,'—the '*opposiveness* between the loveliness of the world and the unloveliness of the human heart,' are expressions which, in their respective places, do not remind us of nature's simplicity. At the same time there is much true beauty and much tender feeling in this graceful little book,—and we know not a worthier function of the Christian Preacher than to make distinct the spiritual ministrations of the outward world. The following passage, which is in excellent taste, is a true record of many an experience:—

"There are seasons in the lives of most, when no voice and no book but the voice and book of creation, have power to awaken us to virtue and to holiness. We have waited on the ministrations of the Sanctuary, and have not been conducted to godliness—we have listened to the most eloquent of preachers, but, spite of ourselves, heeded not the voice of the charmer, charm he never so wisely—we have striven to think the Lord's thoughts on the Lord's day, and have not been able—we have even consulted the pages of the inspired prophets of the Most High, and there was no beauty in them that we should desire them; and all this has happened in our own despite, for with a longing have we longed for something of the heavenly. 'The spirit indeed was willing, but the flesh was weak;' the material had for a season bound the immaterial in fetters; the visible had gained a victory over the invisible. We have gone abroad; we have looked on the heavens and the earth, on the hills and the streams, on the rocks and the trees, on the grass and the flowers; till at length, through the whole pores of the body, have virtue and piety streamed in warmly upon the soul; the sense has ministered unto the spirit; the terrestrial has been parent of the celestial. At such periods we have felt, not without marvelling, that 'as one of your own Poets has also said'—

> 'One impulse from a vernal wood
> May teach you more of man,
> Of moral evil and of good,
> Than all the sages can.'"

Among the illustrative poetry which the Author has quoted, we wonder that Mrs. Hemans' exquisite lines suggested by his

text, 'Consider the lilies,' escaped his notice. It is a pleasure to have any fair excuse for placing them on our pages:—

> 'Flowers! when the Saviour's calm benignant eye
> Fell on your gentle beauty; when from you
> That heavenly lesson for all hearts he drew
> Eternal, universal, as the sky,—
> Then, in the bosom of your purity,
> A voice he set, as in a temple shrine,
> That life's quick travellers ne'er might pass you by
> Unwarned of that sweet oracle divine.
> And though too oft its low, celestial sound,
> By the harsh notes of work-day Care is drowned,
> And the low steps of vain, unlistening Haste,
> Yet, the great ocean hath no tone of power
> Mightier to reach the soul, in thought's hush'd hour,
> Than yours, ye lilies! chosen thus and graced!'

III. A Treatise on Grammatical Punctuation. By John Wilson. Manchester: 1844.

This is a very useful Publication, giving clear and scientific instruction in the much neglected art of Punctuation. The title-page announces that it is intended for Letter-writers, Authors, Printers, and Correctors of the Press,—and also for the use of Academies and Schools. There are two classes of writers to whom we respectfully recommend its diligent Study, and the careful writing out, under competent correction, of every *Exercise* in the book,—which, with remarkable diligence, will be about half a year's work,—namely, young Ladies, and the Contributors of Articles to Periodicals. How shocked and wearied Mr. Wilson would be, if he sat in an Editor's Chair for six months! Nay, we fear, even when the Editor has done his work, and *revised* his proofs,—that the result must be too often an abomination in the eyes of such a severe Punctuator as Mr. Wilson. But, seriously, this is a matter that requires more attention than it receives, to redeem the character of many a clever writer from scandalous slovenliness,—and to make writers who are not clever, at least intelligible.

A minute account of a work of this nature would be out of place in our pages. We can only recommend it as clear, and full, and in all respects sufficient. In his introduction Mr. Wilson gives some ludicrous instances showing the necessity of a stricter attention to punctuation. "A sailor going to sea, his wife desires the prayers of the congregation for his safety." The

request was thus given out at Church:—"A sailor going to see his wife, desires the prayers of the congregation for his safety."

Mr. Wilson has a good deal of experience of printing. The following is his testimony respecting the state in which manuscripts leave the hands of their Authors, and of the necessity of some scientific knowledge of language, on the part of compositors:—

"Until writers for the press condescend to employ the grammatical marks systematically and accurately, the humble workmen who put together the world-enlightening types must be more than unconscious machines: they must endeavour to enter into the conceptions of their literary employers, and to develope the sense of the manuscript, with the greatest possible discrimination, by the use and service of the poor, despised, but necessary handmaids,—the commas, the semicolons, and other little points.

"The observations just made will apply, with even greater force, to correctors of the press. Amid their multiform duties, their peculiar function is to attend to the proper insertion of grammatical marks. No matter how slovenly may be the manuscript—how erroneous the orthography—how badly constructed the sentences—how deficient or indiscriminating the points—how abstract or foreign the subject, and how tasteless the work of the compositor,—professional correctors are obliged to reduce the ill-digested mass into order, and present it to the public eye in at least a readable condition. To accomplish this task in all its perfection, they must themselves be perfect—must be universal geniuses—in other words, must possess an amount of learning and general information, which would fit them for the highest stations, or for the most lucrative employments. This surely it would be *rather* unreasonable to expect in mere operatives; but virtually it *is* expected. How necessary, at all events, that correctors of the press should possess that kind of knowledge which is easily within their reach, and which at present forms an essential and a peculiar feature of their vocation,—a full and accurate acquaintance with the theory and practice of punctuation!"

IV. Hymn to the Week above every Week, Passion Week. By Thomas Hornblower Gill. London: 1844. 12mo. pp. 24.

The name of Mr. Gill's poem seems to be taken from Crashaw's "Hymn to the Name above every Name, the Name of Jesus." It resembles that poem somewhat in its general style, though free from its numerous conceits, wide-seeking imagery, and frequently too bold personifications. The metre is irregular, appearing to accommodate itself naturally to the various chords of feeling, which are struck at different times.

It contains a circumstantial account of the various events which took place from the entrance of our Saviour into Jerusalem, to his death upon the cross. At the commencement the author calls upon Time to ride in rivalry with the week, and announces the transcendant glories of the week over all the records of Time.

"Week! thy little band array:
Count each hour! convene each day!
Time, assemble all thy legions!
Bring all ages! search all regions!
Muster all the deeds of might
That have lifted up the nations—
Gather all the words of light
That have brightened generations—
Dwindling greatness! darkening glory!
Thou shinest all-obscuring Week!
Feebly ages tell their story
When thy days have leave to speak;
Thou in thy scant of minutes but arise,
Time's plenitude of ages disappears;
Thou takest to thyself our eyes—
Thou only soundest in our ears—
Thy hours more teeming than our years—
Thy days diviner than our centuries!"

He calls upon his soul to hasten to meet them, to bring its tribute of gratitude, and not leave its "Reverence and Sorrow" unspoken. He bids it—

"Within each glory wholly lie,
And cling and glow around each sovran sanctity."

The subject begins with the riding into Jerusalem, and the author forcibly describes that most impressive scene. In one verse, we have a description of our Saviour's character and mission, in a rich succession of vigorous and expressive epithets:

"Kindler of the quenched vision—
Opener of the closed ear—
Stirrer of guilt's deep contrition—
Sweetener of grief's bitterest tear—
Straightener of the crooked form—
Lord of the obsequious storm—
Pain-exiler—sickness-queller—
Death-defeater—Grave-compeller—
Rescuer of the Fiend-possessed—
Charmer of the fierce unrest—

Battler with world-shielded sin—
Shelterer of world-slighted woe—
A Mighty One who thrones and world might win—
A Tender One who toil and care will know!"

After a paraphrase of the people's thoughts and feelings of this hour, the author turns to bring those of Jesus before us. The following verse is full of beauty and pathos:—

"And He who Salem's voice invites,
The Prince who Salem's eye delights—
Sits there on his cheek no pride?
Dwells no pride within his soul?
Joys he not thus glorified?
Rides not rapture on the foal?
The people shout—why smiles not He?—
The Tear is where the Smile should be!
The Hour o'er which Delight
Seems clothed with fullest right
Abides in Sorrow's keeping;
The wooed one is not glad;
The exalted King is sad;
The accepted Christ is weeping!"

Then follows a feeling description of the cause of his tears. The joy and exultation increases; children mingle their voices,—

"Thou who didst bless the child! the child is blessing Thee!"

The darker features of the scene are not forgotten, the "Wearers of the gorgeous Vest," "fierce Priest, malignant Pharisee," who scowl with envious hatred on the triumphing Messiah, and whose "pride would teach the Lowliest lowliness."

After mentioning the entrance of our Lord into the Temple, the scene is changed, and we accompany the Messiah to Bethany, where Mary pours forth her offering of affection.

"What jeer can shame, what frown can make afraid
That bearer of the fragrant store?
No strangeness deemed it, that pure modest maid,
The holy Lord to kneel before!
Her loving heart's sublime excess
To her but humblest duty seemed;
The box gave out its preciousness—
Lo! o'er Messiah's feet there streamed
Her odorous munificence—
Nor stayed the tender service of her hair."

The next morning, Jesus returns to the Temple and casts out the buyers and sellers from those sacred precincts.

"How joys that Son of God to render
His Father's house this right!
This rescued, this reclaimed splendour—
He thinks it doubly bright!
O'er all the Temple fondly roves his eye;
That filial eye finds no offence;
He parts in holy pleasure thence,
And asks the stars the way to Bethany."

The withering of the fig-tree and its allegorical meaning does not remain unnoticed. The following day is devoted to the attacks of the Pharisees, to the wisdom disclosed in our Saviour's replies, and the denunciations upon Hypocrites.

"It singly swells, that voice victorious,
Maintains sole sovereignty around,
Holds full dominion o'er each ear,
Grows sternly great—grows sadly glorious;
That voice for graciousness so noted,
To Love's occasions all devoted,
Has now all terribly to sound:
Dumbly, fiercely must ye hear,
Sinners of supreme degree,
Stricken Scribe and Pharisee!
Bitterest silence must ye hold
While sounds your sin where late your prayer was loudest,
While stain by stain your heart's foul sum is told,
And that full Temple where your look was proudest,
Surveys your guilt's vast scroll at fullest length unrolled.

O! when was Evil smitten so?
When was Holiness so stern?
Burn, pure unstained anger, burn!
Nor faintly blaze, nor stint the awful flame!
Thou canst not, Holiest! too intensely glow,
There cannot scorch you, Sinners huge, too hot a shame!"

Then follows the transition from this stern rebuke to the smiling approval of the widow and her mite.

"But whence this sudden joy of face? Oh! why?
O! whither has the sternness fled?
How comes the frown dethroned so graciously?
Why sits the smile all sovran in its stead?
Those lips of bitter words but just discharged,
Why come they burthened now as on glad days?
And from stern duty of rebuke enlarged,
Enjoy the happy liberty of praise?

'Tis thou, Forlorn one! who this thing hast done;
Lone Widow! thou these gracious words hast won—

That offering so poor, so small,
That Soul sublimely prodigal!
It is not in half-emptied hoards to exceed
The lavish bounty of that sorest need.
Know thyself worsted, Wealth! thou hast not earned
An immortality from that kind voice!
Rejoice, uplifted Poverty, rejoice!
Great dignity is thine, the Lord has turned
From smiting high-placed sin to do thee deathless grace!
Kind words to thee, his last within that holy place."

We now draw near to scenes of deeper intensity, the last Supper, the Garden of Gethsemane, the Trial, the Scourging, the crown of Thorns, till the awful close of the whole in the Crucifixion. Of the agony of our Lord, he says:—

"What may'st thou be—
Thou dark imperious agony?
Our souls are powerless to discern thee;
Our little woes can never learn thee;
Their sounding cannot thy least depth discover!
We can only round thee hover,
Cast on thy awfulness an humble glance,
And spare thee all impairing utterance:
Triumph at thy glorious ending,
At the brave kissing of that bitter cup,
At the Angel swift descending,
At thy strong soul, Messiah, springing up!"

The author has passed rather hastily over these great events. Perhaps he may have felt that to dilate upon them would be to infringe upon their solemnity; the feeling of their grandeur may have restrained his pen. He has soared to a high flight in accompanying the Spirit of the Redeemer in his passage to the skies, before he re-assumes his mortal garments. There is no appearance of effort however, and he has shown that his imagination is capable of bearing him into the unseen, though he has till now continued in the domain of facts.

"Flow on, flow on, thou sovran dye!
Heaven wants its White-Robed. 'It is finished!'
Lord, they are said—those words of holiest fame—
That last sublime endeavour of thy breath—
Thy life is doubly in that crowning cry—
Alas! we could not live without thy Death—
We could not glorious be without thy shame!

O! that hopeless, helpless morrow!
Day of Earth's especial sorrow,

With what new joy on Heaven thou breakest!
What angelic mirth thou makest!
Sad soul so sternly parted from the clay,
Freed soul, whose flesh endures a tomb to day,
Dear Lord, forgive the boldness of my love
That waits upon thy flight above,
And notes what sweet observance there is done;
What welcome waits thee in the Spirit-Land,
In what obsequious state its People stand—
How humbly shines each most Effulgent One!

Know ye, awe-stricken souls, the Man of Grief?
Know ye how bitterly he hither passed,
That with you now his smile must be most brief,
And full o'er earth again, its glory cast?
Oh, spare him, for your darling hope's sweet sake!
Ye tellers of the soul, she could not die!
His smile will better your best words and make
Your glorious guess the world's bright certainty!
Where, mightiest ones, ye knew no sure abiding,
Where most ye longed to have, yet wanted still,
There humblest men shall take divinest fill,
And revel in the peace of His providing.

Life-Revealer! haste away!
A little while forsake this Heavenly day,
A little while the Angels softly sadden;
To Flesh and Earth once more consent;
Our yearning souls for ever strangely gladden;
Advance the ages to new ravishment!
Yes, sweetly, gladly lie, thou awful Week!
The glory born of thee is eager to outbreak!"

To those who seek chiefly in poetry a liquid measure and a plentiful scattering of the flowers of fancy, Mr. Gill's poem will not perhaps prove very attractive. It appeals chiefly to the moral and devotional sentiments, and it requires the reader's eye to be alert, and quick in catching the succession of the author's ideas, otherwise he will charge it with obscurity. Energy is its chief characteristic. It resembles more nearly our old English writers, than any modern school of poetry, among any of which we should in vain seek to class it. Mr. Gill betrays some fondness for antique phraseology; but his use of it seldom suggests the idea of affectation.

It is one merit of this Hymn, that it is calculated to enlist the sympathies of all denominations of Christians. Its fervour of devotional feeling, and the deep affection which it evinces to the person of our Saviour, will find it favour among the most orthodox, whilst there is nothing in it which is not true to the feelings

of those who love a purer Gospel, the disciples of the Son of Man. Indeed the poem is itself an evidence of the falsehood of the accusation which is sometimes brought against these followers of 'the Word made flesh,' that in honouring the Father they forget to give due honour to the Son. The strictest follower of orthodoxy would, we think, acknowledge that the poem does not give a demeaning representation of the Saviour.

V. An Apology for Religious Union on Christian Principles, in Letters addressed to the Rev. John Taylor of Glasgow. By John Gordon. pp. 51.

These Letters are addressed to Mr. Taylor in answer to a pamphlet which was reviewed in the preceding Number of this periodical. In our present remarks therefore it is our wish to avoid a re-discussion of Mr. Taylor's Letter; but the importance of the question at issue and Mr. Gordon's able treatment of it seem to us amply to justify, if not to demand, some further notice. We are the more inclined to renew the consideration of the subject from the tone of Mr. Gordon's answer, which is friendly and temperate, yet firm and earnest, affording an example of the spirit in which a controversy between conscientious minds should ever be conducted.

In Mr. Gordon's first letter, after stating the main question, he proceeds to show that religious union may be understood in two senses, and that religion may be a principle of union among all men, though as a bond of visible union it exists only among those whose agreement on certain points leads them to form an association for religious worship. Such an association (like unions of kindred, of countrymen, of the members of a profession, or of the votaries of an art or science) does not necessarily imply a point of repulsion from other men, but only a peculiar agreement among themselves. Its dissolution would not produce a closer union between them and other men, but only deprive them of the peculiar union which they enjoy.

In his second letter the author shows that a religious association must be founded not merely on what may be deemed in the abstract essential to the existence of the religious sentiment, but on what is actually essential to the production and healthy preservation of that sentiment in the minds of the particular persons associating.

"A belief in the character and providence of God may be the only thing 'without which the supposition of religious emotions is a contra-

diction;' but the declarations of a divine revelation may be necessary to produce that belief. The necessity in such a case does not lie where you alone place it,—in the nature of the conviction which gives occasion to the religious feeling—but in the means whereby that conviction is attained."—pp. 12, 13.

It must in common justice and fairness be left to the individuals themselves to determine what thy feel essential to the efficacy of religious worship on their own minds. That which they consciously deem thus essential it is their duty to adopt as their bond of religious union.

"In reasoning with a man who believes Christianity, you are bound to give him credit for the sincerity of his belief; and as long as the belief exists, whatever you may propose to him should be accommodated to the conscientious feeling with which an obedience to that belief will be connected. * * *

"Surely it is not fair to say of those who are influenced by such principles, that in forming the religious associations which their sense of duty prescribes to them, they 'exhibit a desire for the triumph of a narrow theology at the expense of the religious spirit!'"—pp. 14, 15.

Even if the persuasion of *duty* could be reasoned away, it is argued that every man is justified in requiring what he feels to be most for his religious *advantage*.

"Without at all denying the religious character of those who reject the views of the divine administration which he has derived from his Christian faith, he conceives that he is a gainer by being able to entertain those views, &c."—p. 16.

In the third letter our author proceeds to discuss the alleged evil consequences of constructing religious societies upon the basis of such an agreement as he advocates; and shows very clearly that those consequences arise, not from the mere constitution of the separate societies, but from the unwarrantable assumption by men, of a right to impose their own conclusions upon others.

"Religious sympathy is not destroyed by not being extended to acts of united worship, any more than it is destroyed by not being extended to the points of theological difference which must exist among men as long as the human mind is constituted as it is. . . . . Nay, so far from such sympathy being destroyed by the union for worship being connected with other doctrines beside these essential ones, it may be increased by that circumstance. The conscientious attachment to truth which forbids a man to compromise his own views of religion by abstracting them from the acts of worship he performs, if consistently carried out to the relations in which he stands to others, will augment both the pleasure with which he hails any agreement with himself on a

subject he holds so dear, and the respect with which he regards any difference of opinion that may be entertained as conscientiously as his own."—pp. 20, 21.

In the same manner the author contends that the exercise of the intellect on theological points is not necessarily restrained by an association for worship on Christian principles. He then proceeds to say, after quoting a statement of the evils arising from branding any opinions with censure,—

"These things do not arise from the fact that men agree to connect such opinions with their worship, but from the fact that these opinions are associated with false views of the religious liberty which should be conceded to mankind. There are indeed fundamental principles, a consent to which is necessary in all societies. . . . . This is the case with the religious union you contemplate, as well as with a union formed upon a belief in Christianity. If your Theistic association can be reconciled with the right of free inquiry and discussion, a Christian one may be reconciled with that right in the same manner."—pp. 22, 23.

Our readers, if they peruse the whole passage in connection with the above extract, will agree with us in thinking that this point is well put. After applying this reasoning more particularly to the principles of Protestantism and Unitarianism, and warmly claiming Dr. Channing as an authority in favour of Christianity being made a bond of religious union, he makes the following just and important remarks in reference to Unitarian societies :—

"They do not exercise anything of the nature of ecclesiastical discipline upon those who compose them. . . . . Any one, whatever his opinions may be, is at liberty to avail himself of the means for worship and instruction which they afford, without being exposed to the slightest penalty. They visit none with censure. They institute no inquiry into the private belief of any. The mere Theist, if he can reconcile himself to the public services they involve, is as willingly received into them as the Christian believer. . . . You have, moreover, abstained from noticing a broad distinction which exists between the relation sustained by a minister to a congregation and the relation which the members of a congregation sustain toward each other. . . . . The official character of one who is appointed to be a preacher to others, or leader of their devotions, should not be confounded with the situation of those who are only hearers or silent partakers of those devotions."—pp. 28, 29.

In the fourth letter our author quotes the doctrines admitted as indispensable to a bond of religious union, and puts them to the test of the principles on which it is proposed to exclude all other doctrines; showing with complete success, we think, that

on the very same principles they ought themselves to be excluded.

"This doctrinal summary is not consistent with the general principle on which it is professedly grounded. It is chargeable with the fault which you attribute to the theological systems you wish it to supersede. It is too narrow to embrace all religious minds. . . . . Religious affections, in a sense which they consider most appropriate to the nature of the subject, are cherished by men who reject the conclusions which you have laid down. . . . . You might in this way be pushed from every position you could take as the basis of the union you may attempt to form. It would even be contended against you, that no theology at all was necessary to the production of religious emotions. Religion, it might be said, is an intuitive sentiment of the human mind."—pp. 30, 31, 32.

With the *argumentum ad hominem* from which we have given the above extract, the answer to the main question at issue really stops, we think, though no marked division of the subject is here indicated by the author. The remaining portion of his pamphlet, though excellent and apposite in connection with the pamphlet which has called it forth, is not strictly relevant to the general question at issue, being rather a defence of the evidences of Christianity, into which (warm, honest and earnest as it is) it is not within the scope of this article to enter at any length. We cannot refrain, however, from a brief notice of it, and we take this opportunity of heartily recommending to our readers the perusal of the whole work.

Mr. Gordon begins this second part of his subject by pointing out historically the important agency of Christianity in producing belief even in the doctrines admitted as fundamental. They were not actually conceived to be derivable from nature, he maintains, until propounded by revelation.

"That which you cast off as useless to the purpose, was actually the cause of originating the convictions on which your religious theory is built. It is easy for a man after he has ascended to a height on which he securely stands, to throw down the ladder by which he climbed to the elevation, but it is hardly fair for him to deny to the means which placed him in his exalted position the power of effecting the benefit he himself has derived from them."—p. 34.

The author proceeds to show with considerable ability that even now, without Christianity, the doctrines in question could not be satisfactorily supported, the testimony of nature being adducible in opposite directions. He thus sums up his argument:—

"It is quite clear to me, that you ascribe to nature, a power in this matter which it does not and cannot possess; and that the theological

positions on which you are disposed to base your religious union, are really derived, not [from] thence, but from the Christianity you repudiate."—pp. 37, 38.

The fifth and last letter contains a remonstrance in favour of the historical evidences of Christianity, which the author thinks have been hastily and unworthily slighted.

"A true philosophy, as I think, should create a prepossession for, and not against the miraculous facts of Christianity; and the philosophy ought to be entirely beyond dispute, and not of the evidently accommodated character of the one usually employed for this purpose, which is set against so striking an array of historical evidence, as that by which the Gospel is supported."—p. 41.

He then corrects what he thinks a loose and unfair representation of the logical value of miracles when wrought in express connection with positive declarations of doctrine; and proceeds to show that "the philosophical argumentation" on which rationalists rely is far more unsuitable to the multitude than the method of proof which they reject as worthless and absurd.

"Experience has amply confirmed this. Previously to the coming of Christ, philosophical speculation was fully tried in this department, and it failed. . . . . Since the coming of Christ, an historical religion has been tried, and it has succeeded with those upon whom philosophy made no impression. To tell men, as Emerson does in the passage you quote from him, 'to live in the present,' as do 'the roses under the window,' is to tell them to cease to be men. They are not constituted as are the roses. Their minds are made to grasp the past as well as the present. Their knowledge and improvement depend upon their looking back 'with reverted eye.'"—p. 46.

"He discovers more than historical consistency and reality in the books to which his attention is thus directed. The truth which he finds there, exerts upon him a moral power. It commends itself to his conscience; it captivates his affections; it corresponds with his wants; it subdues his will; it realizes his hopes; and in this satisfying and regenerating influence which it exerts upon his heart, a still stronger reason for his assent to the claims of the gospel is contained. In him is fulfilled the declaration of Jesus,—'If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself.'"—p. 47, 48.

Mr. Gordon then recurs to the argument on the general question by appealing to the fact that the gospel is received by Christians in the form he has described, remarking that the propriety of their conduct in associating together for religious worship and instruction must be judged upon their own prin-

ciples, which place Christianity before them in the same light in which nature is regarded by the rationalist. In conclusion the author affectionately introduces a passage from a former sermon by the friend whose present principles he feels it to be his painful duty to controvert. The controversy derives peculiar interest from the fact that the two friends were formerly ministers (though in different denominations, we believe) among the "orthodox" dissenters. The same principle of obedience to conscience which led both to abandon their former sentiments, has conducted the one in a continued course along the painful path of negation, whilst enabling the other, in casting off what he deemed corruptions of Christianity, to obtain even a more warm and cheerful faith in Christianity itself. But the moral principle in both is equally to be honoured, however different its respective results. Every close and attentive reader of the Letters must feel, we think, that the author has thoroughly performed his task, and many passages are apposite and happy, though perhaps the main question might have been more clearly and briefly stated and discussed. That question is simply—What degree of similarity in religious sentiments is it necessary that there should be between the different members of a worshipping society, and, also, between them and their minister, so as most effectually to accomplish the legitimate objects of their association? Those objects may be briefly defined to be the cultivation and application of a religious spirit in the manner best suited to the wants and views of the persons composing the society. Now we think it evident at the outset that the question stands quite apart from the general principle of the right of private judgment and the religious liberty and equality of all conscientious seekers after truth. Those who form themselves into a society of worshippers on peculiar religious principles do not thereby commit any act of bigotry or arrogance, or assume any infallibility; they do not deny to others any right which they claim for themselves. They are simply an association of persons who happen voluntarily to entertain the same or similar convictions on certain points which appear to them important; they associate as worshippers because of their agreement, of which their association is the sign.

Nor does it follow, in the second place, that, because men choose to associate for habitual worship on account of their general agreement in religious views, they have therefore no sympathies with other worshipping societies. The fact of their association implies only that they have *more* points of agreement with each other than with other societies, and therefore adopt habitually a separate form of worship. But they may

still regard all conscientious worshippers with Christian sympathy and affection as children of the same God and heirs of the same heaven, and may be able to join with them occasionally in the same acts of worship.

The question before us then is simply—What degree of similarity in religious views between the members of a worshipping society is necessary to the comfort and efficiency of their union? Surely the obvious answer to this question is—a similarity of view on those points which the parties themselves feel to be essential to the practical efficacy of religion. The main position which Mr. Gordon is engaged in controverting is, in plain English, that the bond of union should consist only of the principles deemed essential by those who believe *least*. We really do not see how this would be less an invasion of intellectual freedom than to insist on the principles deemed essential by those who believe *most*. It would surely be not less arrogant and intolerant to insist upon the universal adoption of deistic principles as a bond of religious union than of the dogmas of the Romish Church. Nay, of the two extremes the latter seems the less unreasonable, since the principles of those who believed least might be included, were many points adopted as essential, whereas the adoption of their principles alone would necessarily exclude much that to the others appeared indispensable. We equally deprecate both extremes. The human mind is so constituted that perfect uniformity of belief cannot be expected, and therefore ought not to be prescribed. Nay, imperfect and progressive as our knowledge, and more especially on religious subjects, necessarily is, it ought to be a matter of rejoicing that differences in mental constitution keep alive a spirit of inquiry and check the hardening influence of prejudice. It is unwise for the members of a worshipping society to bind themselves by a creed, because they cannot foresee what changes their own minds may undergo, much less, what may be the views of those who shall hereafter become members of the society. If the services are such as all feel that they can join in with pleasure and advantage, the imposition of any creed or declaration of faith would be at the best an useless encumbrance, and might probably become a serious evil; and no one who feels that he can join in the services to his own satisfaction should be officially interrogated as to the various points of his belief before being admitted as a member. Whether there be a sufficient conformity between his views and those embodied in the services or not, is a matter for *his* consideration. And here, as Mr. Gordon has properly observed, there is a distinction between a mere attendant on worship and the conductor of the

worship. The minister is in the first instance chosen by the people from the sympathy which his services excite in their minds and his power to meet their wants. Should either his sentiments or theirs as a body undergo so decided a change that such sympathy and power can no longer exist, the purposes of their connection can no longer be maintained, and a separation is then advisable. The separation may be painful and inconvenient, but without the slightest interference with the freedom of conscientious inquiry on either side; in fact it is only by a separation in such circumstances that freedom on both sides can be preserved. The case is different, however, with the mere attendant on the worship. If the services are satisfactory to himself, the other members are not concerned with his peculiar sentiments. His views do not interfere with theirs; it is of no consequence to them if he cannot respond to all the sentiments expressed. But if the minister, from his own conscientious conviction, either habitually appeals to doctrines which his hearers as a body cannot entertain, or constantly refrains from the use of doctrines which they regard as essential to the practical efficacy of religion, and which, therefore, *are* essential to its practical efficacy in *their* minds, it is plain that, in fairness to them, the connection should be dissolved. For him to insist on the sufficiency of that modicum of doctrine in his services, "without which the supposition of religious emotions is a contradiction," seems to us as unreasonable as to expect the members of a musical society, many of whom could appreciate the compositions of Handel or Mozart, to be satisfied with a mere repetition of the simple melodies of Moore or Burns. Here we must stop short; the general question which we are discussing cannot be more definitely determined. The degree of uniformity required, and the points deemed essential in each particular case, must be left to the judgment and feelings of the individuals concerned. We have already stated why it is desirable for shortsighted mortals to avoid all unnecessary minuteness and technicality in the principles on which they form their religious societies. Now that the legislature has broadly and eloquently sanctioned the great principle of the right of private judgment, those who have long and earnestly struggled in vindication of that right should at least continue to show their sense of its importance by scrupulously refraining from all such conditions of religious union as tend to abridge the sacred freedom of conscience, and to produce the grievous heresies of hatred and hypocrisy, and by "endeavouring to keep the unity of spirit in the bond of peace."

J. R.

THE

CHRISTIAN TEACHER.

Art. I.—UNITARIANISM: ITS PRESENT DUTIES AND PROSPECTS.

The health of all Institutions, that address themselves to the higher wants of Man, can be preserved only by their constant Reformation proceeding from an habitual recurrence to the first Principles which they profess to embody, and, without violence or a necessity for sudden changes, maintaining them in fresh and living harmony with the growth of Society, and of the individual spirit. But, especially in any crisis of their life, should both Associations and Christian Men recur to the great leading Truths out of which they develope their Being, to the great Ideas which they aim to represent, and by drawing from the fountain-head of their Inspiration advance to a fuller maturity, and yet renew their youth. To acquire the strength and consistency of manhood in conjunction with young desires, and unexhausted purposes, is to do our work in the spirit of one of God's children,—the peculiar grace of those who keep near to the living Sources of Goodness and Truth, rescued from self-idolatry by a true communion with Christ, a true worship of God.

At one such crisis *we, the enemies of all intellectual divisions in Christ's Church and Kingdom,* seem now to have arrived,—a certain outward stability having been attained by the emphatic and respectful acknowledgment of some important Principles in the highest places of the World,—whilst, at the same time, all the circumstances attending that acknowledgment serve to show how little the Idea of God's Kingdom, which is our characteristic Distinction, has obtained a place in men's hearts, and with what new reverence we have yet to study it, with what new fervency to proclaim, and new fidelity to exhibit its Image

before, won by its Beauty and penetrated by its Truth, the Sects find their bond of union not in disputable Notions but in the spirit of Christ, and, having one aim and love, become one Church of God.

For what are our distinctive Principles, the prevalence and general acceptance of which must measure our progress in our Christian work? Our ambition is not to establish a powerful Sect, not to overthrow rival Creeds, nor to wrest converts from feebler folds, but to establish the true principles of Christian Union, to uphold Christ's view of a Universal Church, to make spiritual sympathies the test of fellowship, and to rescue all who give their hearts to God, and love the Lord Jesus in sincerity, from dogmatic terrors, and dogmatic intolerance. It is not merely either as the maintainers, or as the opposers, of certain doctrinal views, that we wish to stand out before the world; any ground of Antagonism is too narrow for our position; any similarity in doctrine too contracted for our sympathy; we aim at the unity of all God's people, at the formation of a Church which will embrace the Christian world,—with no doctrinal bond but allegiance to individual Truth, with no terms of communion but the common love and worship of the heart. Our true principles are not to be determined by a mere examination of the results of opinion at which we have arrived, but from the great facts of our Faith which are the sources of our religious life,—from the consistent belief that we are the spiritual children of God, and that Christ is the Exemplar of what his human sons may be,—and, as holding *filial* relations to infinite Wisdom and infinite Holiness, bound to expect and seek a continual increase of Light and Goodness from the Parent source of our Being. Our Religion then proceeds from the relations of a human being to the infinite God regarded truly as his Father, and therefore necessarily involves the principle of development in all spiritual knowledge; of personal responsibility for the use or abuse of powers and means; and of the supreme favour and approbation of God always being given to the right desires and affections of the heart. Christ's view of a Universal Church, which is, distinctively, *the grand Christian Idea*, in which amidst all diversities of operations and powers there is one purpose and one love, to bring the heart into union with God as he is revealed in Christ,—this is what we take to be the measure of our Christian work.

Now in this we cannot boast ourselves that our success has been great,—that we have won for this Idea much recognition in the world,—or even that we have set it before ourselves with energy and distinctness. In fact, Christ's purpose of Brother-

hood is effectually frustrated by the doctrinal Christianity of these latter days. Popular Protestantism, in this respect, is the Anti-Christ of the Age, directing the power of every Church against the union predicted by its Head, and under the sanction of his name defeating his purposes. The Church is everywhere like a Citadel garrisoned by those who mistake the will of its Ruler, and turn its arms upon his friends. Like the disciples of old, they take it ill even that we cast out devils in their Master's name, because we follow not with them. Even Romanism had a sublime conception of the unity of Christ's people, and if it required doctrinal agreement, it at least consistently warned against the dangers of private Judgment, and provided an infallible authority,—whilst popular Protestantism invites you to inquire freely, but stakes your salvation on the chances of an Error; admits your right to think, but constitutes itself absolute Judge of the safety of your thoughts.

It would be a great mistake if we were to suppose that the Legislature in its late settlement of questions affecting Presbyterian property had committed itself to any comprehensive Principles of Christian Union. In the spirit of the party who raised those questions, who forgot all their watchwords of Civil and Religious Liberty, and to gain a poor triumph and pittance of support for a Dogma invoked the technical reading of Statutes against the clear principles of Justice; in the spirit of the Law which sanctioned that proceeding and made Legislative protection imperative; and even in the distinctive grounds of prescription on which the Legislature justified that specific protection,—notwithstanding some expressions, from individuals, of the true Spirit of Christian liberty,—we discern but one rigid adherence to a dead definition of Christianity,—and where there is no power to change, to move, with outward impunity, there is no Liberty. For it was not a question affecting Christian Fellowship that was then determined, but a question affecting Property,—and prescription and possession were admitted only in cases where our forefathers had not defined their Creeds, so that not only no parties but even no Dogma could possibly make a claim,—and wherever the earliest occupiers of a Chapel have but stated their religious opinions, under the terror perhaps of the Toleration Act, their descendants, though they have followed in a line far more sure and unbroken than the Apostolical succession, and have adorned with the treasures and affections of many generations the humble foundations of their Ancestors, must even now abide in their notions, or depart from their Temples. And even this last Act of the Legislature concedes to the very parties whom it leaves in possession no further liberty of

Thought, and may silence any Doctrine that has not a prescription of twenty-five years. The civil impunity of any new opinion, in relation to any particular Chapel, depends now on its being therein preached so long, without a legal challenge.

We willingly acknowledge that as much has been done as in the present state of religious parties in England it was perhaps possible to effect, and we rejoice to recognize many signs that there is but little intolerance in the *spirit* of many who have not yet expressly disowned intolerant *principles*,—but we think there is some not unnatural disposition to exaggerate the importance of this legislative act, and to mistake the nature and extent of its recognition of the true principles of Christian union and liberty. Let it be remembered that it only does effectually, what it was the intention of the legislature to do, and what it supposed it had done, more than thirty years ago. We have obtained a measure of security for ourselves, a sanction at least for what we are, and what we have been; but there is no sign that our peculiar mission is about to be taken up by more powerful voices, or that our occupation is gone,—we must only feel our obligations more strenuously than ever to proclaim the liberty of the Gospel,—to diffuse true views of the leading spirit of Christianity—of the individual nature of Religion, and of the kind of aid that God gives to the free soul through his Revelations. Liberty, like Property, has its Duties as well as its Rights,—in fact it has rights only because it has duties. Each man must be free, because each has to rise into elevation, truth, and force of thought through the use of his own faculties, and each is bound to offer to his brother whatever he has found to be an aid to his own progress. Thankful then for our own privileges, and the concession of just rights, yet witnessing small approach to a true Christian union, there never was a time when our own responsibility was greater to recur with zeal and love to our first Principles, and to remove out of the way whatever obstructs their progress. A Catholic Christianity is our great aim, a Church of Christ in which the love and service of our Father as he is imaged in his Son make the terms of Communion;—what stays its extension in the world?

In the first place this never has been set before us with sufficient distinctness as our peculiar work, nor have we always seen that if this Catholicity could be obtained, doctrinal errors would cease to be of much importance, because they would be deprived of all artificial and corporate support, and would continue in existence only so long as they had the natural power and recommendation of Truth to individual minds. And yet surely it is a more hopeful undertaking to

persuade the world that God will not destroy the future happiness of a honest heart for an intellectual error, than in any other way to sap the foundations of a long-established Creed,—a more hopeful undertaking, for example, to bring discredit on the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Symbol, than to overthrow the Doctrine of the Trinity. If we could remove the idea that, where there is sincerity and love in the heart, salvation depends upon opinions, the terrible basis on which many a fierce error is sustained would be taken away, and Truth and falsehood meet together in their own strength.

Instead of this we have confused ourselves with the Sects in our eager advocacy of Dogmas, and we have suffered the world to acquire a settled impression that the great Controversy between us and other Christians is about the relative weight of textual evidence for the Unity or the tri-personality of God,—whereas we ought to have maintained our great Controversy upon the terms of Christian Fellowship. Even *controversially* this would have been our wisest course, for if it can be established that by the love and service of God, as he is shown in Christ, a soul may be saved, it is not too much to say that few will *gratuitously* believe the Incarnation of God, or an Atonement effected by the death of a divine Being, or the Eternity of future Punishments. It is, doubtless, often our duty to meet special errors and to contend for special views, but it is our *first* duty to strike down that artificial basis of terror which upholds so much unexamined Theology, under the fear that to remove a Dogma may be to forfeit salvation.

Again, though it is true that the fathers of Unitarianism in this country were men of deep and earnest piety, yet the adoption of a dogmatic, rather than of a Catholic, Christianity to be maintained and defended, as the work assigned to them on earth, naturally led them to place their hopes of success, more in the relative strength of the conflicting Doctrines, when fairly exhibited by Controversy, than in the power of that simple faith of Jesus, as the Son of Man and the Son of God, which apart from all Controversy has yet to establish the kingdom of Heaven upon Earth. We have therefore worked long and unprofitably in directly assailing the errors of religious minds,—in contending with the prejudices or the convictions of those who already had a religion of their own, with which they were content. We hold that there is no more hopeless task, and that there ought to be no more hopeless task, than by direct assault to disturb religious convictions, so long as they minister to the piety and life of the hearts that entertain them. The only way to shake the belief of such minds is to exhibit

the presence and outward fruits of a Piety, Holiness, and Goodness, the loveliness of which they had not heretofore conceived, and which their own Faith will not produce. But so long as men are moved by no spiritual desires which their own faith does not supply, they are not ripe for change. The first preparation for conversion is in the stirring of a deeper religious life within the heart,—and he who can excite that want, and kindle that love, will obtain a hearing for the faith that feeds it. No doubt the truth of certain views of God may be debated on grounds quite independent of such considerations, but no popular interest will wait upon the discussion. Now with us this new interest in the fruits of our Faith has never been excited, nor have we always commenced our attempts at conversion by offering a diviner image to the heart. The world knows that we assail the Trinity, but it does not know that we have planted in its heart Christ's view of the Kingdom of God. The argument has been maintained on grounds *external* to the spirit of Religion,—grounds of criticism, interpretation, philology, history, philosophy. It is not by these argumentative demonstrations that any revival of the primitive spirit of Christianity is to be effected, any birth of spiritual impulses that, overlooking Doctrines and Forms, will unite men in the great affections which are the seminal principles of all grandeur of Thought, and nobleness of Life. We confess that we look for such a new birth of the original impulses of Religion in this Country,—and when it comes it will ally itself to that form of Christianity which is most *real*, practical, and simple, and which seeks the inspirations of God nearest to the fountain head,—and then not only will that Faith to which this new movement allies itself have a sudden spread and extension, but itself will take a purer leaven into its bosom, and break forth into more earnest and original forms:—and when we say *original*, we mean that originality which comes from the inspiration of the heart and the moral feelings, not akin to the discoveries of the Intellect, but to the impulses of Genius. It has always been that the regeneration of the world has come, not from any thing naturally expected to proceed out of its existing instruments, but from some fresh movement of the spirit of God,—but though from God, yet only to an age that is ripe for it, and in the fulness of Time.

If now it be asked when may this time be looked for, and what are the signs of its coming,—we believe that it will come whenever a fresh ground is prepared, and Christianity is sown again in a virgin soil,—whenever again the Poor crave the Gospel,—when the great popular mind becomes religious, as it

one day will,—when the people, especially the intelligent and educated part of them, feel the necessity for a *Faith*, a solemn and grand Trust to uphold the struggle of Existence, and yield them contentment and elevation in their places. Hitherto the people, justly dissatisfied with their social condition, but not educated into clear-sightedness, have been blindly casting about for some means of happier and better life:—Socialism,—Chartism,—Co-operative Institutions,—Political redemption, have all been looked to,—all of them proceeding partly from a right spirit, but essentially wanting in a religious element and the principle of a righteous self-government,—and all of them failures. This last the heart of the people is discovering that they cannot do without. When, the burden and oppression of the times will suffer this feeling to ripen into fruit, we dare not predict,—but assuredly he knows little of the great Operative class, who doubts that they are in quest of some *sentiment* to give dignity to their life, self-respect and reverence for their own being and destinies,—to explain their condition to themselves,—and whenever their cravings strongly set in a religious direction, they will not combine with that religion which has kept silence over their sufferings and wrongs, which in alliance with the supreme power opens not its mouth against the sins and burdens of Wars, Monopolies, and unequal Laws,—nor yet with that religion which with mystical metaphysics encounters the great facts of God, and the urgent wants of the tasked and yearning heart,—but will be drawn towards that faith, wherever it may be found, which brings the Life on earth into the closest practical connection with the love and care of God. And have *we* not a Religion suited to the wants of men beginning to feel the spiritual requirements of their life,—and in whose existence there is nothing artificial to withdraw them from the realities of God? Have we not a religion to lift up sunken man, to make straight in the desert a highway for our God, to calm with great and gentle thoughts a brother's heart struggling against the inequalities of life? Certain it is, that our Faith has never yet been sown in this virgin soil. We have cast it amidst thorns of theology, already in possession of the ground, that have grown up and choked it. It is our especial duty now to be watching for this new spiritual soil which God is preparing, and to impregnate it with principles of life before it is wrested from us by more zealous hands. In this way, with this view, our faith has never yet been preached. The time is ripening,—and we are waiting for our prophet. He will come in God's good time,—the Agent who is to give an impulse to this work. Meanwhile it is our glory to prepare for him, and be his fore-

runners. The Ministry to the Poor, and the Education of the People, will make straight the way of the Lord.

And for ourselves, whilst our Liberty runs into no licentiousness, into no wantonness of thought, into no rash and irreverent haste in speaking of religious things, yet must we remember that Liberty is given to be used, in ever new approach to Light and God,—and that he is not free but dead, who grows not in truth and power. It is a responsibility, which we do not feel enough, that, if we are right in our views of the Catholic nature of Christ's Church, the fates of the Gospel are, in some respects, committed to our hands,—not indeed that they depend upon us, but that God elects us to this service. To talk for Unitarianism, and in our lives brings disgrace on Christ, is the most direct way in which it is possible, in this age, to obstruct the truth and peace of the Gospel,—to betray the Son of Man with a kiss. Would to God that we were, at least, moved by the desire to realize some image of the Kingdom of Heaven on Earth, some works of Children of the Highest, and Brothers of Mankind, that would prove Faith by Love, and hasten the reign of righteousness and peace!

Art. II.—LOGIC, REASON, AND REVELATION.

A. So you have just finished the Memoir of Henry Martyn a second time. I am really surprised! That book contains so much of cant, or mysticism, or enthusiasm or—I do not know how to call it—that I did not believe you would endure even one perusal.

B. I do not deny that the book in question contains sentiments and views which I entirely disapprove, and, to say the truth, are really painful to me—views and sentiments indeed, which some years ago would have completely disgusted me, and probably increased the many harrassing doubts on Christianity which, as you and all my friends know, have more or less existed in my mind since I re-embraced the Gospel upon my own conviction. But my faith (to use a Scripture phrase) is perfected in weakness.

A. What! you also using cant!

B. What! you who know me so intimately—can *you* believe your own charge or suspicion?

A. Well, that is exactly what bewilders me. I know you to be incapable of attempting deception. I hear you speak on theological subjects with a boldness which, in any other person, would be a sure indication of unbelief; and yet when I am hourly expecting to learn from yourself that you have shed the second slough, and stand on the square with the mass of thinking men in Europe, you baulk me with a strain of devotion which startles me. I rub my eyes, fearing that I have dreamt of you while talking with an evangelical old lady.—But do not be angry.

B. Far from it. You ought to recollect what I have often told you—that my mind keeps a store of almost every thing, which affords a denomination to religious parties of the most opposite descriptions. Were it possible for any one to see that intellectual repository—and observe with how much care and attention fragments of every system are kept there, I should be strongly suspected of being nothing but a kind of religious antiquarian—a CURIOSO as the Spaniards denominate all collectors. No wonder, therefore, if I now and then bring out some shreds of evangelicism, as you call it. Indeed there is this essential difference between the *Curiosos* and myself—that they keep their collections for amusement; I keep mine for use.

A. Do you mean that your religious opinions and sentiments are taken from systems opposed to each other?

B. Unquestionably.

A. Are you in earnest?

B. I am indeed; but you must not mistake me. I do not profess to believe contradictions. It is not my fault that people are determined to make contradictions for themselves, by struggling to reduce their faith to a *logical system.*

A. Surely you do not wish them to be illogical on such an important subject.

B. Are you quite sure that you have a clear notion of what should be called *logical* and what illogical?

A. A child almost might answer that question. What is according to *reason* is *logical*—that which does not follow from your premises, is illogical.

B. Well; your answer shows how vastly spread is the mistake against which I caution you. You are neither a child, nor an ignorant person, and yet you confonnd together notions totally different. Have you never observed that *reason* is a much more comprehensive word than *logic?*

A. I consider the two as nearly synonymous.

B. That, however, is the common mistake, which I wish to remove. You have been more than myself in the habit of reading geological books. You know how strongly the improved method of searching for truth in physical subjects cautions us not to be hasty in forming classifications, and not to take names which have no other voucher for their correctness than the classification itself, as premises for further conclusions. Now the search for truth, which collects facts without rashly attempting to connect them into a chain of immediate and remote causes, is one according to *reason;* but it is not *logical.* On the other hand, such systems as before the diffusion of the Baconian rules, were constantly raised; systems where all facts more or less correctly observed, were forced to arrange themselves under names indicating genera and species, which might be employed in constructing syllogisms, are, correctly speaking, logical systems. They may happen to be true; and in that case they will be both logical and reasonable, but the former quality does not ensure the latter.

A. I am fully aware that a consequence may be logically true, and yet really false. But what has this to do with your cabinet of theological fragments?

B. It is thus far connected with it, that I neither break nor grind my fragments of divine truth, in order to make them join together as a piece of Mosaic. They often—nay, generally present such irreconcileable outlines that no human ingenuity can explain how they may be in reality portions of the same whole. I leave them as I have found them. If I have sufficient reason to believe them a part of Divine truth, I do not insist on mutual connection. They may appear entirely at variance in their

shapes. My concern however is with the substance. Had I a complete knowledge of the whole, I should find that the most irreconcileable projections might be perfectly adjusted by means of a portion not yet in my possession.

A. That I declare is a very convenient way of indulging the most unbounded caprice on religious matters.

B. I have already guarded against that charge, by saying that I examine the substance of my fragments. There are of course external evidences of their origin which cannot be overlooked by any man desirous of finding the truth. Were I to find any detached doctrines, however warranted genuine by external marks, in substantial opposition to each other, I would certainly cast off one of them as spurious. To drop metaphor, were I told that in one part of the Scriptures God had revealed that he would make the worthiest specimens of human virtue objects of eternal wrath, because through pure *mistake* they had not embraced any one of the formularies of faith received among Christians, this fragment of doctrine would not find a place in my cabinet. The reason is that this fragment is evidently of a different substance from that which is constantly found in the most authentic parts of divine revelation.

A. You mean that it is *contradictory* to other parts of revealed doctrine.

B. I do not mean any such thing. Observe once for all that *contradiction* is a matter of language exclusively. If I said God is omnipotent—God is not omnipotent—the logical definition of *omnipotent* being, to me, in both propositions the same, I should be uttering a *contradiction*; i. e. I should say nothing. But in such case I should be entirely employed about mere verbal signs. True reason would be perfectly inapplicable to such a question. When I speak of the substance of a doctrine (a metaphorical expression to which I am confined by necessity) I mean the *indefinite* yet experimental notion which the doctrine awakes in my mind. I will venture to elucidate this by the Calvinistic doctrine of arbitrary election. If you tell me that St. Paul, by divine revelation, says that God elects one man to be eternally happy and leaves another to be eternally miserable without any thing that in human language we can call a *ground* for this conduct, I instantly reject the supposed doctrine. You may make it as direct an inference from St. Paul's language as that of any syllogism in *Barbara*, but I will not receive the *notion*. It brings me in contact with a Supreme Being whom I cannot acknowledge to be the same with him whom a clearer revelation has taught me to call my Father, and the Father of all. Your inference is *logical*. Revelation cannot be *logical*.

Do not be startled. *Truth* and *Logic* cannot be found together, except where the verbal signs are made by definition an accurate representation of the several notions which they must necessarily embrace. This being unquestionably so, I will not construct a syllogism to prove that all *logical* inferences from verbal signs of things beyond our experience, and above our comprehension, must be *false* in reality.

A. So I am to infer (though perhaps you will object to that word) that there is no arguing you into theological doctrines?

B. If you mean by *logical* argument, you are perfectly correct in your inference. Observe however that your inference is *reasonable* but not logical.

A. I cannot help thinking that your distinction, however ingenious, is of no practical utility.

B. Pardon me, if I oppose my own experience of its utility to your impression upon the subject. Had I not found out this distinction, I fear I should have relapsed long ago into the unbelief which the *logical* system of the Church of Rome, I may say, FORCED upon my young mind.

A. Your mind, I suspect, must have some peculiar bent, which I have not discovered in any one else.

B. I will not stand up in defence of my mind. But if I may trust a long and attentive observation, I am entitled to say that the *unbelief* of the present day arises chiefly from a neglect of the distinction which I have stated.

A. What! would you wish me to attribute the prevalent disbelief in Christianity to strict adherence to logical inference? I had not given our age such credit for syllogistic accuracy.

B. Nor am I at all inclined to advocate the claims of our contemporaries to that scholastic praise. The attempts at *logical* accuracy, the endeavours to bring religion into a logical system, are not theirs. But the Gospel was, many centuries ago, gradually reduced to a metaphysical theory, in which every doctrine was supposed to be logically connected with the whole system. The technical language of these doctrines was imagined to be as correct and significant as algebraic expressions; each word containing in itself a certain number of notions which might be syllogistically developed and demonstrated. The Quakers and Unitarians excepted, I believe there is not a body of Christians who are not taught some such system of Christianity as necessary to salvation. If you doubt or reject any one link of this logical chain, you are told that you have nullified your faith in Christ. In vain shall you protest against the inference. LOGIC peremptorily demands your damnation. You must be a heretic or an infidel. The consequence is obvious;—any man

who has more mental independence than superstition, is sure to throw up the whole system.

A. But how would you have Christianity taught?

B. As it is in the New Testament — by detached hints. St. Paul speaking of the highest knowledge which man can obtain of God in this life, compares it to the imperfect reflection of a glass; and were the English translation more literal than it is, the character of the representation would be expressed by the word which I have used—i. e. *hint*, or suggestion. The passage is in the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, (ch. xiii., v. 13,) and deserves a more accurate rendering than that in which we have it. To say, "for now we see *through a glass darkly*; but then, (i. e. in a future life) face to face," diminishes greatly the force of the image which St. Paul employed. Δι' ἐσόπτρου does not mean *through a glass*, but *by means of a mirror*: ἐν αἰνίγματι is not properly speaking *darkly*. The word implies that even the image which the mirror reverberates, is not a copy but an emblem—a sort of hieroglyphical figure, which throws out hints of the reality. From this kind of knowledge it would be absurd to draw logical inferences: it would be as preposterous as to make the cock, or the hawk, or the serpent used in the sacred writing of the Egyptians, the premises for scientific conclusions, in regard to the notion *hinted* at by means of those emblems—to measure the length of the cock's tail or comb, in order the better to understand the nature of the vigilance which it symbolically expressed.

A. But do you think that Christianity taught in that manner would have much effect?

B. It would have the *practical* effect for which it is intended. Observe St. Paul's course of thought in the passage just quoted. Having declared that the knowledge which revelation gives us of invisible things, is partial, broken, enigmatic, he proceeds—"And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three." And, as it were to preclude speculation every way, he concludes by giving the preference to *charity*, the most practical, the most social of these virtues. I am in fact strongly convinced that Christianity will not have its full effect till all philosophical speculations are given up in connection with it.

A. That is indeed a bold assertion.

B. I do not consider it as mine, but as St. Paul's.

A. Where do you find it?

B. The spirit of it I find repeatedly—the direct injunction is in the Epistle to the Colossians (ii. 8). Philosophy and vain deceit or "empty deception" (which in religious mysteries are one and the same thing) will, according to St. Paul, *strip* any man of his

Christianity, and, in a spiritual sense, leave him as naked as the captive whom an enemy has spoiled of every thing.

A. But that was *false* philosophy.

B. Can you tell me which philosophy is true in regard to the nature of God, and his operations on the human soul? I do not object to the attentive study of the Scriptures with a view to find the philosophical connection of several facts stated in them. Such *theories*, such plausible explanations, may be more or less satisfactory: they may give great pleasure to certain minds; and where that is the case let that pleasure be enjoyed by the individual who finds it. But why should it be forced upon others, as if it were impossible that the operations of Divine grace could have effect, unless we accept a philosophical view, i. e. a *reason why* they benefit us? There is nothing more dangerous than this pedantic theology.

A. Pray where do you find the danger?

B. In hazarding the admission of a revealed *fact* on the truth of a mere theory. The fact that Christ has redeemed us, and that through his sufferings we have pardon for our sins, when explained as a matter of something like *physical* cause and effect, becomes absurd to my mind; and I thank God that I can receive it without any such theory. It is really profane and absurd to my notions and feelings to hear that God *could* not pardon sin upon mere repentance; that God's justice required punishment, and that some one—he indeed that had no sin—must bear it, else mercy must retire defeated. To those however who find such speculations satisfactory I will say nothing; only let them not force such theories upon me. Revelation demands the acceptance of the blessings of redemption; but the *philosophy* of those blessings, the *reason* why they were imparted in a particular manner, can be known to God alone.—Observe every where, in that kind of theology which I deprecate, the supposition of *some necessity* to which the Divine economy must yield—some notion, that *God could not* do this or that thing: some obstacle to be surmounted, some law of spiritual *nature* which must be followed. Theology in that shape is only a system of philosophy applied to the facts revealed in the Bible.

A. Do you reduce all the great questions which have agitated and still agitate the church to *philosophical* disputes?

B. Yes. From the first to the last. What else are all the questions about the Trinity? Are they not rash inquiries concerning (mark the absurdity of the word) the *nature* of God, and his mode of existing?—But I repeat that I will not quarrel with any Christian for being fond of such speculations. What I complain of is his demanding the acceptance of his *philosophi-*

cal speculations as the condition of his recognizing another man for a disciple of Christ. Thus in regard to the question about the person and *natures* of Christ. Christ is unquestionably a *Man,* and a Man, *in as much* as he is *man,* cannot be God; the *subject* (I speak logically) of the proposition "Christ is God," seems alternately to reject the predicate and to be capable of it. If it is made to mean the *man* Jesus, the predicate becomes contradictory; if it means any other Being, the proposition, though apparently one, becomes two; and it has two subjects. It is here that theological logic becomes bewildered. The *unity* of Person which has been invented to save this difficulty is a mere quibble. A perfect Man who is not a person, is a strange contradiction.—There are minds that will not submit to the pain of enduring this Theological jargon. Were it not for the theological rage of raising a physiological theory on such points, all those who *worship God in Christ* might hold communion together, *in silence* about the manner in which Christ is one with God.

A. Can you propose any means of putting an end to such evils?

B. The only one is to cease to consider Theology as a science.

A. Strange! What! the *Queen* of *Sciences* to be dethroned? The whole body of Doctors of Divinity—those very persons who stand at the head of every University in Europe, to be stripped of their honours, and declared to know nothing at all!

B. Except in Roman Catholic countries, that change has taken place in a great degree. Who indeed ever imagines at Oxford or Cambridge that a D.D. must necessarily know even the rudiments of general literature; and what is more, who takes it for granted that such a personage knows anything about the religion he professes? It is indeed a secret conviction of the futility of the studies called Divinity, that *chiefly* has put an end to the existence of a regular course of Divinity at Oxford and Cambridge.

A. But do you mean that there is nothing to be learnt in connection with religion?

B. By no means.—But what is to be learnt is exactly that which must in course of time banish the *Logical* Divinity from the face of the civilised world.

A. I wish you would explain yourself more clearly.

B. I will. There are a great number of facts connected with Religion: there is also an enormous mass of Philological knowledge which is inseparable from it. The only true Theology would therefore consist in a thorough knowledge of the two languages in which the different portions of the Bible were ori-

ginally written; and in antiquarian and historical researches into every fact relating both to true and *pretended* revelation. Such studies, indeed, have already shaken *Logical Theology*, and everything built upon it, in the whole of Germany. The cry of selfish interest, policy, and superstition has given a respite to the old speculative Divinity; but its days are counted wherever *free criticism* is not so severely punished by public opinion as it is in England. And, indeed, fierce and powerful as English bigotry is still, it will not be able to keep its ground much longer. Political changes are impending, and have already begun, which will deprive *British* intolerance of its sting.

A. Am I therefore to understand that *critical* and *historical* knowledge are the enemies of what you call speculative Theology?

B. Certainly. Speculative Theology is essentially connected with, and dependent on, *church* infallibility. No Protestant church can pretend to cultivate the Theology which produces speculative Articles, without the most palpable inconsistency. To deduce *speculative* theorems upon *supernatural* subjects is madness, except on the supposition of a supernatural guide.

A. Well then: have we not the Bible? Is not the Bible a supernatural source of knowledge?

B. The *origin* of the Bible is indeed *supernatural*; but, as it speaks the language of men, it cannot convey its meaning with any degree of that accuracy which is absolutely necessary for *scientific* inference. Theology, therefore, or any *theoretical* system which pretends to sanction its doctrines by divine authority, is a delusion.

A. You puzzle me extremely. According to you I should believe that the Bible is of divine origin: in other words, that the Bible is one of the *miracles* of the system of revelation,—a book produced, at the least, with the assistance of *supernatural* causes. Yet this *miracle* is so insufficiently provided with means of producing its effect, that people might as well have been left without it.

B. You misunderstand me. I never said anything that can justify your last sentence. The Bible is a supernatural book, addressed to every Christian. Whoever reads it with an earnest desire of profiting by its contents, rises a better man from its study. In regard to the hopes of man after death,—to the trust of man in his Maker, in spite of moral and physical evil,—to the special grounds of that trust, arising from the *unity* of Christ with God, his mission, his death, and resurrection,—lastly, in regard to the moral duties of man, and, above all, in regard to his *moral* tone of mind, his principle of moral action, and the means of keeping up and improving it, there is a *practical* agreement

among earnest Christians, which shows how much may be learnt from the Bible, without an unerring rule of interpretation. Instead, therefore, of trying to discover an authority to settle the meaning of the written revelation of God—or, what is the same, instead of *inventing* a method of giving certainty to the sense of the Scripture—men should consider that it is implicitly *revealed* in the whole Bible that no such authority can be found—and that no such authority is wanted. The Romanists urge the Protestants with the argument that the Scriptures are useless if there is not an unerring interpreter of their sense. I have always answered that, in a similar manner, the supernaturally-endowed interpreter can do no good, unless his supernatural appointment is *unquestionable.*

A. I believe I have heard you say that at one time of your life you drew an argument against Christianity from these very premises. It was this—the Catholics prove that Revelation is useless without an infallible interpreter; the Protestants prove that there is no such interpreter: therefore the Protestants prove that Revelation is useless; in other words, that there is no Revelation. How do you now answer your own argument?

B. I deny that the Catholics *prove* that Revelation is useless without an infallible interpreter. They *prove* indeed that proposition to such Protestants as believe that saving faith consists in assenting to certain *theorems*; but they do not prove it to me who know the contrary.

A. So you would wish the Christian world to be without any creed.

B. I wish every Christian to study the Scriptures with humble prayer, and to believe whatever he thinks he finds in them; but I also wish him to keep his *theorems* and *explanations* to himself. Whether he is a Christian or not, his conduct, and the *spirit* or tone of mind shown in his life, will decide. Christians might thus recognize each other not by *watch-words* but by *character*. Congregations or churches might be formed, with the object of mutual improvement, under the Christian sympathy of *trust* in God (Faith), of hope of eternal happiness, of charity and love to each other and all mankind. Misconduct should subject the erring member to admonition. If he went away, the charity of his deserted friends should try to reclaim him; if he wished to remain, and yet continued to offend, he should be excluded.

A. But what would the spiritual instructors preach?

B. The *practical* spirit of the Gospel.

A. Do you not see that every one would narrow or enlarge that word, according to his views?

B. I do see it; but do you wish me to set up the very thing

I condemn? I certainly do not intend to make myself a Pope, or to help any man into such an office. The check to enthusiasm and metaphysics, which in time I hope will become effectual, is that of *experience*. Experience of the absurdity and evils of church infallibility produced the Reformation. Experience of the *insufficiency* of a Reformation which still makes *salvation* to depend on *logical* inference deduced from any language, and especially the *figurative* language of the Scriptures, will abolish *metaphysical* creeds among all sensible men, till Church Articles (unless they be *practical*) will be among the curiosities of literature.

A. I wish you would give me a specimen of your practical articles.

B. I will; but only as a specimen of the *sort* of thing I mean. To lay down the rules for a Christian Church or Association would require more labour than I can now afford, and more talent and power than I ever did or shall possess. But I must premise that by Church I understand a small company of Christians. There should be thousands of these voluntary Associations, all united by Christian benevolence, and all enjoying the most perfect Christian liberty. Here, however, is my specimen.

"The Members of the Christian Church of N. acknowledge the whole Bible as the highest authority on *religious* subjects. The New Testament is their rule of *morals*.

"They acknowledge Christ as the *Son of God*, in whatever sense Christ himself appropriated that title to himself. But, although they will endeavour to find the sense of those words for themselves, they will neither teach nor condemn the sense in which other individuals understand them.

"They will observe the same rule in regard to all other disputed doctrines which have no *external* and *perceptible* consequences.

"They admit Infant Baptism, with solemn prayer for the infant.

"They celebrate the Lord's Supper by eating bread and drinking wine, in commemoration of Christ's death, and in hope of salvation through him.

"Their rules of conduct are chiefly reduced to this passage of St. Paul's Ep. to the Philippians (iv. 8.): 'Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things.'"

A. All this is very good, but very vague.

B. Certainly not more (I will not say vague, but) unconfined

than the Scriptures. Why should we attempt to *mend* God's works? Why should we demand *technical* accuracy where God has *purposely* left us without the means of attaining it?

A. Why do you say *purposely*?

B. Because it would be absurd to suppose that in the plan of Revelation there was an important omission, by *chance*.

A. Allow me to ask one question more.

B. What is it?

A. Shall you have no article on the Atonement?

B. I have already included it in the *hope of* Salvation through Christ.

A. But do you say nothing about the *manner* of the Atonement?

B. I beg you to remember what I have said already. Yet allow me to repeat that I do not consider the Atonement in the light of a *phenomenon* which men can explain in the way of *cause* and *effect*. I cannot approve of the established explanations—that God *could not* pardon, without inflicting pain on some one—that the sufferer must be of such or such *nature*, else the payment, *in pain*, would not be sufficient, &c. &c. Of all Theological metaphysics, or physics, this *demonstration* is to me the most odious.

A. But still you hope to be saved through Christ?

B. I do most certainly.

Art. III. — EDUCATION; THE CHEVALIER PAULET AND HIS SYSTEM.

Every establishment which has education for its object deserves the public attention: but when the principles and the discipline of an institution are blessed by good results, when an institution serves to prove how much the will of one man inspired by genuine charity can effect, any account of it becomes doubly interesting.

The Chevalier Paulet, born of an Irish family that had settled in France, served as a subaltern during the last years of the German war.—The obstacles to advancement however discouraged him, while the independence which an easy fortune promised, seduced him; and, although still young, he quitted the service upon the restoration of peace.

He passed some years at Paris in a whirlwind of frivolities, and his entire life might have rolled away in this careless inactivity, had not a fortunate circumstance developed the germs of the virtues which afterwards distinguished him.

He was hunting one day in the forest of Vincennes: and seeking shelter from a storm, he beheld a child of about eight years old lying in a ditch, in which the water was gradually rising, and from whence the child did not appear to have sufficient strength to withdraw itself. M. Paulet gave immediate and eager assistance, and finding the object of his care in a state of extreme weakness, had it taken to his own house at Paris. He learnt from the child that he was the son of an invalided soldier; that, after having lost his mother, he had lived by begging; that, not knowing where to go, and meeting with no aid, he had wandered for some time in the forest, where, up to the time of his being discovered, exhaustion had compelled him to remain in the situation in which M. Paulet had found him.

The condition of this miserable child deeply moved the compassion of his benefactor. He continued towards the boy every attention requisite for restoring his health, and had very soon the satisfaction of seeing it re-established; and as benefits create attachment towards their objects, this child, who was in other respects of a good disposition, became, on his convalescence, an object of lively interest to his protector. He kept him in his own house, made himself his teacher, and found in the success of his cares a charm which very soon gave him a disgust to dissipation, and to the life which he had hitherto led.

His pupil brought to him one day a comrade of his own, and supplicated M. Paulet to withdraw this child also from misery by taking him home. M. Paulet consented without hesitation, and soon afterwards extended the same kindness towards some miserable children of veteran soldiers.

He formed a plan for the education of his young pupils, and embraced the opportunity of recommencing his own, which his first vocation had rendered incomplete. The progress made by his pupils corresponded with his own zeal, and repaid his beneficence. He grew passionately fond of an employment which afforded him such pure enjoyment; his pupils became his children; all his other projects were subordinate to that of extending the benefits of his system. He retrenched all superfluities, and reduced his expenses within the limits of what was strictly necessary.

Fortune itself came to his assistance, by bringing him a large and unexpected inheritance. He made a vow to be poor all his life; he saw in this augmentation of riches only the means of giving extension to his plan, and from that time his house was metamorphosed into a school.

There he received by preference the children of poor soldiers. He had shared the miseries of the profession; he had often considered that the pay accorded to the defenders of their country is not in proportion to the evils they suffer, and the dangers they are exposed to. He had preserved a secret preference for military institutions; he was convinced by experience that a great number of individuals cannot be maintained together in order and regularity without a rigorous adherence to established rules. He preferred therefore the form of *military* discipline, and he hoped that by encouraging the usual fondness of children for the exterior of this profession, he should more easily obtain submission to those laws which they would themselves be charged with executing.

He formed simple and distinct laws for his little republic. He named the officers who were to become its chiefs: these chiefs formed a permanent council, charged with the entire executive power, and to whom he gave the privilege of electing its own members, and replacing them. He formed a police-guard which was to be relieved every day, whose functions were determined by express regulations; and, the impulse once given, he seemed to reduce his own functions to those of counsellor and friend.

He was able to deny himself every ostentatious enjoyment; he employed the strictest economy in order to effect a saving of money, and, that he might do much, he did all at a small

expense. By banishing from his house paid domestics, he removed the possibility of arbitrary command and passive obedience. He maintained his pupils in a state of mutual dependence, and taught them betimes that the performance of useful functions is not degrading.

Every subaltern officer was in turn charged with the ordinary details of the establishment under the inspection of another officer, who was himself to report to the council. The subaltern officer for the week received each day his provision-money for the market, and, assisted by him who was cook for the day, was charged with all necessary purchases for the family. Cleanliness, which has so direct an influence upon health, was rigorously exacted. He established among his pupils a reciprocal exchange of little services. Their toilet was simple, but, owing to the sustained attention of their benefactor, never was any negligence allowed to creep into its details.

M. Paulet had among the number of his pupils some children of poor gentlemen. Determined to give them an education which might restore to them the rank in society, from which they had fallen through misfortune, he felt that the principle of equality to which he desired to subject them must, however, be modified so as gradually to prepare these young people for the place they were to fill in society: but since any distinctions to be without danger should not be very obvious, he gave to them all the same uniform, made them eat at the same table, sleep in the same rooms, and compelled all without exception to preside in the kitchen in their turn.

M. Paulet gave to his plan of instruction all the extent of which it was susceptible in an establishment of this kind. The course of studies for gentlemen's sons consisted of three languages, of geography, history, dancing, general literature, mathematics, drawing, music, and fencing. He took care to regulate their occupations according to the aptitude and probable destination of each individual. He did not lose sight of the importance of the useful arts and mechanical trades. He hoped to form men who would carry into society the brilliant advantages of a careful education, and the salutary example of a sound morality. He provided himself with all means of developing the genius of those who might show the germ of it, and he did not neglect to establish in his house a nursery of honest artisans.

He did not spare any thing in the commencement of his plan which might serve to organize the establishment in a manner the most favourable for its progress. He procured able masters and simplified the methods of instruction; he set up workshops

of different kinds. Gradually there were formed within the institution, young men qualified to replace their teachers.

M. Paulet employed the talents of these for the profit of the community. This distinction redoubled their activity and zeal, and they augmented their own knowledge while they were teaching; the efforts of these pupils animated themselves, and this arrangement, valuable in respect to emulation, was still more so with regard to the economy which M. Paulet was obliged to practise.

This respectable man had the satisfaction of seeing his institution prosper. He succeeded in placing out advantageously some of his pupils. His pecuniary means increasing by family inheritance and by donations, he augmented in proportion the number of his pupils, amounting at this time to 193.*

In cases of competition for reception into his house, his choice was always guided by an enlightened beneficence, and if latterly he appeared to depart from that rule by receiving into his seminary some young persons from court, it was because he knew that to be useful it is necessary to be protected, and because at this period he had need of support for obtaining from the government a spacious locality, fit to receive his establishment, now become too considerable for its original seat.

In a great capital the multiplied visits of the curious could not fail to occasion his pupils much loss of time. M. Paulet guarded against this by appointing three hours per week for satisfying the eager desire of those who wished to be presented to him. The exterior of his house indicates the simplicity of the owner. It is manifest, from the irregularity and incongruity of the buildings, that his plan has been extended little by little, and that the revenues have always been absorbed by useful and pressing claims.

A child of ten years old in a blue uniform, with a musket on his shoulder, stopped us at the carriage gate to inquire our business, and on our reply permitted us to enter.

M. Paulet received us in what he calls his saloon of arts, which is a room furnished with deal tables and straw seats. After a very polite and modest reception, he said to us, showing us the pictures and engravings with which the walls were adorned, "All, Gentlemen, that you see here, is the work of our children." He perceived by our surprise that we awaited an explanation, and he gave us the history of his school of design. He informed us that he had begun by taking a master, in order

* There were besides these about 100 young men placed as apprentices to divers trades out of the house.

to prepare some of his pupils for the academy; that these pupils had, according to the custom of the house, given lessons to the beginners, and that from the time of their doing so his school had been of no further expense to him beyond what was requisite for materials. He added that he had sent to Rome two of his young people to perfect themselves in the art. He pointed out to us a large oil painting, which one of these two last pupils had composed and executed without assistance. It was the resurrection of the widow of Nain's son. He told us that an artist, whose curiosity had been awakened by the exhibition of the picture, had attempted to give advice to the boy, and to criticise the performance; that after some general observations, he remarked that the young man whom our Lord had recalled to life, stretched out his hands to his mother with too much action, that his look was too animated, that he was in fact too much *alive* for a person just resuscitated. "By the cares of a physician, I grant you," replied the youthful artist, "but not when recovered by the will of God." This response, full of genius, is remarkable for its justness, proceeding from a child thirteen years of age.

M. Paulet introduced us afterwards to his work rooms; these rooms are long, and are furnished with two rows of tables, which every morning replace the sleeping mattresses, the latter being removed to receptacles within the wall. We were struck with the silence and the order that reigned there. A sentinel, charged with police duty, walked gravely from one end to the other. Our arrival did not occasion the least distraction to any person. Every child appeared seriously engaged in his work. They were divided into little classes, which differed as to age, occupation, and number. Each class was presided over by a pupil charged with the office of instructor. In another hour we should have seen these little masters under the instruction (in other departments of learning) of those they were now teaching. This alternation of command and obedience, which varies their habitual state, secures reciprocal respect, forms the young people to gentleness and patience, and from the active superintendence of their adopted father, can never degenerate into a mischievous compromising ceremonial.

We have stated that the sons of gentlemen had privileges with respect to their studies. The children of common people who are intended for a mechanical profession learn only to read, write and cipher; but M. Paulet permits voluntary attempts of every kind. If he perceives in any one of them an ardent desire for information, any marked talent, or merely a rising

inclination for study in any department, he encourages it to the utmost of his power, and never leaves in a lower rank any but those whom nature herself has condemned to labour with their hands alone. The variety of examples, which he has under his eyes, and the habit of observation, have so perfected his judgment, that he ascertains the capacity of a child with a kind of certainty; and not only does he assort the parties, and their vocations, but he knows how to employ all the resources of emulation in order to hasten their progress. We need not, therefore, be surprised if the results of this able management should to some appear miraculous. He pointed out to us a youth of 12 years old who was presiding over a working class, and desired him to show us his own performance. The boy took from his portfolio some eclogues of his own composition, which he read to us in Latin, in German, and in French. His Latin was pure, the style correct, and the composition displayed both imagination and taste. M. Paulet informed us that he was not a gentleman's son. He had not put him to general literature until his taste for it became evident; and in order to give us an idea of the rapidity of his progress, he assured us it was only fifteen months since he began to learn Latin. He afterwards introduced us to a lad of 14 years old, who was directing a class in geometry, and begged that we would question him on the subject. The youth answered us with presence of mind and accuracy; and without hesitation read to us a comparative estimate of parallel passages from Horace and Boileau, in a manner to prove that he could already judge and feel literary excellence. We remarked a boy of nine years old who was directing a class of six scholars in drawing, the greater part of whom were older than himself. We saw from his portfolio some specimens of his talent, which, it appeared to us, could scarcely by possibility be the work of a child of such an early age. One of the pupils who was standing motionless and without employment near a barrier, excited our attention. We learnt from M. Paulet that this youth was in a state of punishment; and that, except in very grave cases, where the offender was deprived of his uniform for a longer or shorter time, all the punishments of his school were reduced to a compulsory inactivity; the duration and form of which varied according to the nature of the offence. He told us that he did not interfere personally with judicial sentences; that they emanated from a council which had established rules for their guidance; that for himself, he avoided even being present at such deliberations, as much for the sake of removing from the exercise of justice every influence independent of the law, as to place those whom he had made the depositaries

of it under a necessity of employing their own judgment, which thus became strengthened by use.

He said that, in difficult cases, the council often deputed one of its members to request his assistance in the deliberation; and that, at such times, he confined himself to giving his opinion together with the reasons for it clearly expressed, as if he were merely one of the party; after which he withdrew, to leave the judges at liberty to decide according to their own conviction.

A subaltern officer, of ten or twelve years old, here interrupted him, to report a scholar of an adjoining room, whom he had condemned to an hour's inactivity. We went to see the culprit: M. Paulet inquired of him why he was under punishment. He replied that it was for having answered the sentinel, who had commanded him to speak low. "I am surprised," said M. Paulet, "that you, who know so well the necessity of silence and order, should put yourself in a situation to be punished by a younger boy." He praised the sentinel for knowing how to make himself respected by attending to his trust; and the officer for having done his duty, notwithstanding the pain it must cost him to punish a comrade. "Off duty," he then said to us, "all my boys are equal; but, as I require that the police be rigid, it is requisite that discipline be respected."

We returned to the saloon of arts to hear some music: we there found a complete orchestra, whose leader, a youth of fifteen, played very well on the violin, and led the band with much precision. They played symphonies, in which each one took a part by turns, and executed them with much ease and admirable correctness. Another scholar performed afterwards a concerto on the harp, the composition of a comrade; and we heard afterwards a sonata on the harpsichord, composed by him who executed it; and this performance surprised us as much as all the foregoing. Time was wanting to enable us to hear one of the masters on the violin play alone: this boy, before he was fifteen, had composed an opera; in which, M. Paulet assured us, he had displayed much genius. We descended into the great hall, to see the boys at parade; and found all the pupils ranged in order of battle, in a line, perfectly steady and silent. The major, a young gentleman of sixteen, the eldest boy in the school, and president of the council, was out of the ranks, sword in hand: at his command the troop moved in double steps, in order to form a circle. Each officer then reported the behaviour of his troop for the last twenty-four hours. The accused were admitted to justify themselves: witnesses were heard, and deliberations taken; and, as soon as the judges had formed their determination, the major stated, in a loud voice, the number of offenders, the nature of the misde-

meanours, and the appointed punishments. The troop then defiled in the greatest order, having at the head a band of twelve wind instruments (the band all pupils of the establishment), who played a march composed by one of them.

"You see," said our guide to us, "a sample of the manner in which we fill up our time. We rise at *five* o'clock, whatever the season; we have prayers; we arrange our rooms, and dress: we then take our breakfast of bread; after which we set ourselves to work. In order to avoid weariness, we frequently change our occupation, and we pass from one kind of study to its opposite, which serves as relaxation. We dine at eleven on soup and meat; and we are never more than twenty minutes at table. After dinner we march to the sound of the drum; or we exercise ourselves in the shed appropriated to gymnastics.

"The sound of the drum again recalls us to our sedentary pursuits, till six o'clock; when we quit them for supper. In the summer, after this repast, which consists of soup and vegetables, we usually walk again. In winter we treat ourselves with a little music; but at nine o'clock precisely all the house retire to repose. I have some workshops in my establishment, and the young people you see out of uniform are watchmakers, engravers, tailors, cordmakers, who have quitted work for Parade: they are subjected to the discipline of the house. There are a great number of others who want situations: I have been obliged to trust them out of my sight to other masters in their respective trades; but in order to preserve the good principles I have given them, as far as depends on me, I require them to come and pass their Sundays with my other boys. A portion of this day of repose is employed in various exercises of a religious nature; the remainder of it in useful recreations.

"Although my boys are always occupied, they are not overworked: and you may judge of that by their look of health. Their progress is rapid, because I find infinite resources in the encouragements of honour, and in their attachment to myself. I have banished corporal and arbitrary punishments, because such punishments must be made daily more and more severe, in order to preserve their effect. The idle are enough punished by the little progress they make, and by the mortification of working under younger boys. Those who offend against discipline or the police are punished by the law: they have only themselves to blame for it: they see that I am always pained by their fault, and disposed to soften the rigour of their chastisement, if I were able to do so. You have seen that I give all credit to those who distinguish themselves. Praise gives, in good dispositions, a desire to merit it. I only seek a useful direction for self-love. I never

designedly inflict humiliation; but I sometimes pique a scholar who fancies himself very clever, by showing him his own ignorance. It is not so much the desire of prevailing in competition, as the love of acquirement, which I excite among my scholars. I keep a close look-out against the germs of envy, which rivalship might develop; and I make learning subordinate to moral character. My chief endeavours are directed to the education of the heart; and all my children are united by the bonds of mutual kindness. Religion they learn to know by its connection with morality. When sufficiently informed in its tenets to qualify them for communion, I occupy them afterwards only with the moral precepts and their application.

"As toleration is a branch of charity, I have not excluded Protestants from my house. Some of these the priests have attempted to disturb; but I have succeeded in being master within my own walls: these young persons, being educated in the religion of their parents, regularly attend divine service in the Swedish chapel.

"We have also some beginners whom you do not see here. I have reason every day to felicitate myself upon having offered lodging, food, and raiment to a certain number of young persons whose talents promise a brilliant career; and who have no means of maintaining themselves in the metropolis, although it offers them opportunities of gratuitous instruction. I have been obliged to limit the number to twenty-four; but perhaps I shall be able to multiply them hereafter: and I even entertain a hope of eventually extending to strangers the advantages which hitherto have been restricted to subjects of the king." He then described the plan of his projected establishment, in which he proposes to carry up to eight hundred the number of his pupils, comprising in this amount three hundred pensioners, to be lodged separately within the precincts, subjected to the same discipline, and brought up in the same principles. All those aids which may complete the education of a gentleman, and workshops for all the arts and trades, are united within these walls. The munificence of the king, and individual benefactions, which the respectable character of the above institution has attracted, make up the very considerable funds which such an undertaking requires; and nothing appears likely to prevent the immediate execution of it.

All persons whose position in the world gives them influence over establishments for education will undoubtedly find in this of M. Paulet a model as near perfection as the nature of human things admits of. Partial imitations may easily be effected; but the *devoted zeal* of its author is the great thing to be acquired. This extraordinary man found in his own *heart*, more than in

his *genius*, the means of doing extended good. His pupils are his children in the most energetic sense of the word; and the tender attachment with which they repay his cares is not the least touching circumstance to be remarked in this numerous family. When the head of the institution walks through his work-rooms; when he pauses to question them, it is not respect mingled with fear that their manner expresses: confidence sparkles in their eyes, and you may see that they are speaking to a friend.

It is difficult to decide whether this good man is not more happy than he is respectable. The enjoyments of his sensibility are as extended as those of his beneficence: and to *that* no limits can be assigned.

When any of his pupils (being arrived at an age to reap the advantage of their education, and to benefit themselves and society) find an advantageous post, he sees them depart without regret. The end of his solicitude is fulfilled, and his benedictions accompany them; and the tears of joy which he sheds when informed of their after success, or upon receiving testimonies of their gratitude, sufficiently prove that there are pleasures of which one may not tire.

Perhaps the generous heart of some rich man will be opened by this example to the desire of creating for himself a happiness so pure: to merit the respect of the present generation, and the homage of posterity.

Happy the country which should give birth to such a citizen!

Extract of a Letter from the Rev. Mr. Dumont.

"March 1788.

"I have been to M. the Chevalier Paulet's to-day; and have spent more than two hours at his house with inexpressible satisfaction. I am conscious of all the difficulty of appreciating an establishment of education. That which is *obvious* is the least part of its excellency, which lies much more in what is not exposed to view. We must follow the pupils to their bed-rooms, to their sports; study the impressions made upon their hearts; calculate the power and effect of the habits they contract; and possess understanding enough to foresee whether or not the impulse generally given to the minds of the pupils is calculated to make good men and true citizens. You must be aware that two hours of observation are not enough for enabling one to decide upon the intrinsic value of a plan which requires a long experience before judgment ought to be pronounced upon it. M. Paulet is a very superior man, who has considered *reality*, and not ostentation, in all his regulations. His pupils appear to me discreet, modest, laborious: everything corresponds with the account I received from M. Pictet. I have read several exercises in

French and Latin; I heard their music with great pleasure. The order of the house is admirable.

"M. Paulet related to us a circumstance from which you will conclude that the young people brought up by him have no need of a catechism. The Governor of the Invalides had spoken to M. Paulet of a man, who, in the last war, had his arm shot off. He was said to have carried a bomb to the battery after being thus wounded. He requested a comrade to lend him a knife, and completed for himself the severance of his arm, which was only hanging by a piece of flesh. Then placing the bomb upon his left shoulder, he said, 'Soldiers must serve as long as they have life in them.' This trait of character being noised over Paris, excited a great deal of enthusiasm, The Chevalier Paulet invites this brave man to dine at his house: he introduces him to all his family of pupils; and adds, 'My friends, I cannot place at table beside a man who has so well fulfilled his duty, any except those young people who have never failed in theirs. Assemble the council, consult the registers: those who have never been entered there for any fault are the only ones who will have the honour of dining with him.'

"In an hour after, an account of the scrutiny was rendered up to him. He found that half the family were in a state of exclusion from the table. 'None of you,' said he, 'have anything to complain of. You are silent: that is a confession in itself, and does you honour, my friends; and in acknowledging your faults you repair them. I permit you to stand round the table during the repast.' He recounted to the brave soldier what had passed; and, dinner being over, invited all, without exception, to drink the health of the French hero.

"Thus their attention is incessantly directed to the cultivation of morality. The principal law of his code is, 'Do unto others as you would they should do unto you.' The Chevalier Paulet appears to me to enjoy the recompences of virtue. He is lively, animated, always in action. I am persuaded that there is no happier man on earth. There is moral beauty in his physiognomy. His wisdom is precisely that which suits the life which he has embraced. He is more merry than grave; he has on his lips a smile of indulgence: he is familiar and caressing towards his pupils. I heard him calling some of the younger ones by tender and frolicsome appellations, as Fanfan, &c. &c. Fanfan not having his musical instruments in a good state, the Chevalier made him take off his uniform for two days. After this sentence he walked round the house, came back, and demanded a song. Fanfan, without any ill humour or pouting, prepared to sing with the pleasantest voice in the world.

"I should become tedious were I to burthen myself with all the details; but I will come again to this house, which interests me more than I can express; and if I am struck by some new object of interest, you may depend upon my communicating, as a faithful friend, whatever may render you a sharer in my pleasures."

Art. IV.—THE INSPIRATION OF SCRIPTURE.

If it had been intended by Providence that the Scripture should exist as an Oracle, from which Christians might derive infallible knowledge on theological questions, and if such was the importance of this object, that God performed as many miracles in the composition of this collection as there are writings in it, it is impossible to conceive that the whole of this mighty preparation of supernatural certainty should have been allowed to miscarry—not for want of another *miracle*, but by allowing a *natural* event, which has already happened, to be delayed some centuries. Had the invention of printing taken place in the time of Alexander or the Ptolemies, every critical doubt, at all events, would have been removed; and though (unless we also possessed a divine declaration concerning the degree of inspiration of those writings, and the manner of arriving at the *inspired sense*,) we certainly should possess no Oracle, still we should have an infinitely greater degree of certainty, in regard to the mere authenticity of every part of the New Testament. Here is a natural method of attesting the supposed verbal Oracle, which no *related* miracle can equal in efficiency. Can it then be conceived, that if Divine Providence had purposed to make the salvation of millions to depend on the *text* of the Scriptures, so simple and yet powerful a means as the art of printing should have been overlooked?

All these considerations apply with much greater force to the Old Testament. The power of superstition to blind even highly-cultivated minds is in no instance so evident as in the real or apparent agreement of Divines on the inspiration of the Old Testament, taken as one individual book. We say real or apparent agreement, because we cannot but think that there is a certain number of Protestant Clergymen in England, who, entertaining great doubts on that point, yet fear to approach it; and keep themselves in ignorance of every thing which might overthrow their more than vacillating belief. This state of mind arises partly from fear of the orthodox, and partly from that intense awe which possesses men when on the point of laying a bold hand on any object of idolatrous veneration; and, unquestionably, the *bibliolatry* of England is boundless. The mighty theory which would set up every book of the Old Testament collection as an integral part of one great Oracle, beginning at Genesis and ending with Malachi, is so destitute of even the shadow of a foundation, that the fact would be almost mysterious, if we did not know how prone all men are to have some

external object before which they may prostrate themselves. In regard to the New Testament, we know with some probability who were the authors of most of the writings contained in that collection; and being sure, in the same degree, that they were men highly endowed for the particular purpose of propagating Christianity, it is not surprising that the veneration due to their writings on that subject should gradually have settled into the notion which attributes to them infallibility. But any one who, having taken the trouble to acquaint himself with the uncertainty and obscurity which hangs over the books of the Old Testament, concerning their authors and the history of the respective manuscripts, still supports the infallibility of those books as a necessary condition of Christianity, must have subdued his reason more effectually than those who conceive the infallibility of the Pope as a legitimate consequence of the truth of the Gospel.

The books of the Old Testament, as historical documents, have a very great value; but he that proposes them as compositions miraculously derived from God, and directed by Him to all mankind as infallible oracles, lays such a burden upon Christianity as must inevitably sink it. To assert the *infallibility* of the Old Testament is to condemn the New.

History, especially that of France, has shown how helpless Christianity appears when it is forced to make common cause with the Old Scriptures, *considered as divine oracles*. If, in the present state of knowledge, the *whole* Bible continues to be represented by Christian Divines as an Oracle from heaven, whose every proposition must be taken as a declaration to which all men must either submit their understanding or give up all hope of being benefited by the life and death of Jesus, the profession of the Gospel must soon be confined to the clergy, and a few unthinking women and peasants. This fear would deserve no regard, if the establishment of such an Oracle, inseparably connected with and forming the basis of Christianity, could be proved to rest on the direct command of its Founder. But, since all that can be alleged in favour of such a hypothesis is mere conjecture—a conjecture evidently arising from the *supposed* necessity of such an Oracle, a *supposition* entirely grounded on the controversial notion that the essence of the Gospel consists in assent to abstract doctrines—the anxiety for the fate of Christianity which arises out of this question is not a mere feeling, it is the voice of reason in unison with that of reverence and love to the author of the Gospel.

Let any candid man consider the state of the question; and that we may do so as free from verbal fallacies as possible, let us

not call it a question on the *inspiration* of the Scriptures, but rather explain that vague word by the practical end to which a universal practice applies it. The practical result of admitting the *inspiration* of the Scriptures is to establish the Bible as an authority which can be *infallibly* used by man. The question is therefore reduced to this:—Is the Bible an infallible oracle?

What proofs, then, have we of the affirmative conclusion?—*Some texts of the Bible itself?*—But is not this a glaring instance of the argumentation in a circle? In what does this differ from the Roman Catholic reasoning to prove the infallibility of their Church? If there is any difference, it is in favour of the Roman Catholic argument: for the *infallibility of a living oracle* would certainly answer the supposed purpose of that infallibility. The living oracle may give successive answers, and explain his meaning; but a written oracle could only be called infallible in relation to the meaning of the author of the oracle. The most genuine divine oracle, in human—and, what is still more, in *figurative* words, must be capable of more falsity than truth: since, of the many senses which it may convey, *one* alone would be true, and all the rest *false*. But let us, for argument's sake, forget this conclusive argument. Let us examine the chief passages of Scripture which can be made the ground of Bible-infallibility.

Those passages appear the most plausible which contain expressions of Christ in which the authority of the Hebrew Scriptures is acknowledged: for instance, "The Scripture cannot be broken." But can such expressions afford a basis on which to establish the infallibility of the whole Bible? The Scripture of which Christ speaks is in the Jewish part of the Bible. The union of the New Testament with those Scriptures is an act, not of the Apostles themselves,* but of the early Christian Societies. The collection of the Bible, as we possess it, was a work of considerable time. Though we possess but a scanty information as to the manner in which this collection was made, yet we know with certainty that the collectors were under doubt, and had to proceed according to their fallible judgment in admitting or rejecting several books. To apply therefore the words of Jesus to

* The words relating to Paul's epistles (2 Pet. iii. 15, 16) are the strongest proof that Peter could not be the author of a writing which this very passage proves not to have been composed till the epistles of Paul were collected together as one book. Peter must have died long before, especially if it is admitted that he died under the same persecution with Paul. Paul had not even an anticipation that his epistles would be collected. In the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, ii. 15, he refers to his other *letter* to them. If he had intended or expected that his *letters collectively* should be a divine oracle for all Christians, how frequently would he have referred to that collection!

the New Testament, is an assumption for which we have not the slightest ground. Equally ungrounded, indeed, is the application of the passages, in the Epistles, which refer to the Old Testament as an authority. But, in respect to Christ's words, and indeed to all words addressed to the Jews on that subject, we should never forget that the Hebrew Scriptures were, to the Jews, a divinely authorised law—religious, political, and moral. As long as the Jewish polity existed, "the Scripture could not be broken," i. e. the Hebrew Scriptures afforded to every Jew the authorized standard for the regulation of his actions, notions, and language. In the case to which the sentence before us was applied, Christ's enemies were ready to stone him for blasphemy, because, in their opinion, he had used expressions which made him equal with God. Christ uses the best justification of his language which was possible in those circumstances. 'The sacred Writings, he answers, call Gods (Elohim) the men who were placed as Judges over the people of Israel. If, therefore, David applied this appellation to common men without blasphemy, much more is the Messiah (for such I have declared myself) worthy of it.' Jesus and the Apostles, it is true, speak of David as a man to whom a holy *inspiration* (we must not forget the vagueness of the word) had at times, and for particular purposes, been granted—he was one of those divinely gifted men called Prophets, who from time to time were to appear, to assist by their instruction and admonition in the government of the Jewish people, modifying and explaining the original constitution given by Moses.* That great legislator himself had recognised and sanctioned the authority of these men—not as infallible oracles, since he provides against their possible errors, or, it may be, their evil designs, but as helps towards the great end of the Jewish dispensation. The Prophets were a regular class of men, educated to be teachers of the people, and regularly instructed in music and poetry, which, among the Hebrews, as with all primitive nations, were considered very conducive to a state of mind most fitted for communication with the Deity. Among these men some were selected by the peculiar Providence which guided the Jewish people, to be distinguished by the gift of foreseeing some events connected with the future destinies of their nation. But the chief employment of those whose writings have been

* See Deut. xviii. 15—19, comparing verses 19 and 20: where it is evident that *a prophet* is used collectively for the many prophets who appeared at different periods; else the contents of verse 20 would be inconsistent with all that precedes. If Moses had spoken exclusively of *one* prophet, he could not have added, "but the prophet, which shall presume to speak a word in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, even that prophet shall die."

preserved, seems to have been that of moral instruction adapted to the gradual, though slow, progress of the nation from a very rude to a more civilized state. In the writings of Isaiah, for instance, we find higher moral views than are contained in the books of Moses. But the general object of the prophetic writings, seems to be the encouragement of the people under some peculiar circumstances of danger or suffering. In a nation so rude and illiterate as the Jews, written compositions of any kind must have always appeared as something more or less approaching to the Supernatural. That a man not regularly educated in the schools of the Prophets should be able to produce any poetical composition, as it happened in the case of "Amos, who was among the herdsmen of Tekoa," could not but seem miraculous. The sudden appearance of Saul among the prophets was a subject of astonishment.* But even the writers of history, and the collectors of moral proverbs, could not fail to obtain a high degree of popular veneration: for either they must have been prophets by education and profession, or, their talent must have obtained them a place among that class. The duty of deference to the admonitions of such men, especially when their writings had been added to the collection of the Jewish Bible, with the approbation of the national authorities, was a part of the constitutional law of Moses.† Hence the established weight of what, in the language of the New Testament, is called *the Scripture*. This obedience and deference was not, however, necessarily grounded on a belief of the *divine infallibility* of every part of those writings. It is well known that the opinions of the Jewish Church (as our Divines love to call the Jewish priesthood) were perfectly unsettled upon the subject of inspiration. This is an important fact, in our present question: for the strongest argument for the divine authority of the Jewish part of the Bible, is derived from the circumstance that Jesus and his apostles must have spoken of those writings in the sense of the *Jewish Church*; recognising the canon which that church admitted, and approving the notions of inspiration which that church received. Nothing, however, can be more fallacious than this view. It is indeed quite surprising that so few have remembered, in connection with this subject, that the *Jewish Church*, in the time of Christ, consisted of Pharisees and Sadducees; that the latter rejected all the Jewish Scriptures, except the five books of Moses; that nevertheless the Sadducees were allowed without opposition to be High Priests, and to hold the first places in the Sanhedrim, a body in which the highest ecclesiastical authority was lodged;

* 1 Sam. x. 11. † See Deut. xviii.

that, if Jewish *tradition* is to be the foundation of our belief in the divine infallibility of the Jewish Scriptures, we have to choose between the tradition of the more ancient church branch—the Sadducees, and that of the more modern pretended reformers, the Pharisees; that, even among these, the notions of inspiration were far from being established as a point of Jewish faith; for Josephus, a Pharisee and a Priest, in his answer to Apion, which was a public defence of the Jewish religion, establishes the principle that Moses had only a *general* divine call to legislate for the Hebrew nation, and explains the expressions, "thus saith the Lord," and "the Lord said unto me," by a conscientious persuasion that such a *general* commission gave a divine sanction to his own judgment.* If this had been a very unusual opinion, if it had been a view against which the whole priesthood would as readily have protested as our Clergy at the present day, Josephus could not well have ventured to use it in answer to such an opponent as Apion, who would have appealed to the Jews themselves against the apologist.

But, on this point, we need not have recourse to conjectures. The conduct of Jesus in regard to the Sadducees, puts an end to all doubt, by showing that belief in the Hebrew Scriptures, as an *inspired and infallible* collection of writings, was not considered by him an essential point. Let us suppose that Christ had entertained the notions of Scripture inspiration which are now common among us: how then could he have treated the Sadducees with so much mildness? How could he have omitted to reproach them for the rejection of by far the greatest portion of the Hebrew Bible? Yet there is not a word of censure against this view; there is not even an insinuation on the part of Jesus against the unfitness of such men for the priesthood. When he argues with them he limits his quotations to the books of Moses, without saying a word against the opinion which reduced him to this limitation. The Evangelists who have recorded Christ's severe and indignant censures of those Ultra-believers, the Pharisees, do not mention the slightest reproach against the Sadducees: and yet, if we believe the theory of Scripture infallibility, those men must have been the worst of heretics.

This unquestionable fact appears conclusive. The expressions of the Christ and his apostles, commonly adduced as proofs of the divine infallibility of the Hebrew Scriptures, must lose all weight in this controversy, when placed in juxtaposition with this mode of proceeding. That the Scriptures of the Old

* Contra Ap. L. ii. § 16. ed. Richter. Lipsiæ, 1826.

Testament were appealed to by Jesus and his disciples, when disputing with the *Jews*; that they were recommended to the *Jews*, as the best means to judge whether Jesus of Nazareth united in his person the signs of the long expected Messiah, is certain; but it is equally evident that such references and appeals were never made when addressing Gentiles. Besides all this, whoever will examine the New Testament with an unprejudiced mind, must be surprised at the exceedingly sparing use which Jesus made of the Hebrew Scriptures. Had he looked upon them as our Divines do; had he intended to sanction those writings as infallible oracles for all future ages, his conduct, in respect to the Sadducees, his omitting to give us a positive declaration on that subject, and his contenting himself with a few quotations from some of the Scripture writings, would be perfectly inexplicable.

When, from this point of view, we look at the best treatises on the *Inspiration of Scripture*, it is perfectly astonishing to see how very little will satisfy men who are strongly predisposed to establish a theory. "It is hardly consistent," say they, "with the dignity of Scripture to suppose the writers left *liable* to any false reasoning."* But should such a question be decided according to each man's notions of *dignity*?—This is to adopt as a principle, that God must always have acted according to our *expectations*. If this be granted—if we are to judge by our notions of what is "*hardly*," or altogether inconsistent with the dignity of Scripture, the conclusion must inevitably depend on our previous arbitrary measure of that *dignity*. And here we see even an acute logician arguing in the usual circle—the Scriptures must be inspired because they are the Word of God, and they are the Word because they are inspired. On what is the dignity of the Scriptures made to depend but on their *inspiration*; and yet the *quantum* of the inspiration is to be measured by the dignity of the Scriptures!

The same author stumbles upon the leading principle in this question, and then lays it aside as a mere incidental thought. "It is inconceivable that God should interpose miraculous agency for the accomplishment of any object, and then allow his purpose to be defeated through any defect in its application" (p. 136). This principle completely destroys the theory of Bible infallibility. If *certainty* was the object, and we cannot conceive any other, it is impossible that God should have laid its foundation on *probabilities*. But what else has this able writer found throughout this question? "The persons who wrote the

* See Hinds on Inspiration, page 162.

Bible and those who were appointed to govern God's people of old, were divinely commissioned and miraculously qualified, so far as was needful" (p. 27). We ask, how far was it needful?—Whatever answer may be given, must be a matter of conjecture, and it will certainly depend upon some *preconceived necessity* either of miracle or inspiration. Had not the notion (which evidently orginated in the early Christian Writers called FATHERS) that Christianity is essentially a system of metaphysical doctrines, and that saving faith consists in admitting statements as true, which our reason rejects either as false or groundless,—had not this spurious faith gradually obtained full credit among Christians, in consequence of the furious controversies of the clergy, the theory of Scripture infallibility would have lost ground in proportion as the Jewish habits of mind which brought in that notion declined, together with the number of Jewish converts. But the moment it was established that salvation depends on the acceptance of certain propositions, as directly proceeding from God, it was impossible for Christians to remain without a *divine oracle* which should, at all times, declare which were the eternally *saving*, and which the eternally *destroying* propositions. As the Jews had the Old Testament given to them for a *national rule* on all matters whatever, it was easily supposed that it had been given also in the character of a perfect and *true rule*. Look into the works of Cyprian, for instance, and you will find that, in the middle of the third century, the Jewish notion that the Old Testament should continue among Christians as an oracle to be consulted on all points, was established as an incontrovertible principle. And now it was plausibly urged—is it possible that a more perfect dispensation should be left without a similar rule? Proceeding on the gratuitous and false supposition that *doctrines* were the essence of the Gospel, this question could not but be answered in the negative. It was then concluded that since the Jews had oracles, the Christians must have oracles too. "Well, then (said the clergy), the apostles and some of their immediate disciples have written on the subject of Christianity. These writings, therefore, must be the Christian *Scriptures*, and they must have been intended by God to decide all controversies among Christians: consequently they must be infallible; and in order to be infallible they must have been inspired or dictated by God."—Inspired? Dictated?—"Yes: *so far as was needful.*"—Needful for what?—For the purpose of ascertaining what doctrines save, and what doctrines destroy the soul eternally." But you forget, we would say, that this *object* is established on a mere SUPPOSITION. Remove this supposition, and the *need* ceases

But, "it is monstrous to suppose that God should have committed his Revelations . . . to uninspired records." There are very few things of which we can assert *a priori* that they would be monstrous in the plans of Divine Wisdom. The permission of moral and physical evil would appear a monstrous supposition to any intelligent being, who, without a knowledge of our present state, should judge that supposition *a priori*. Whether the *Revelations* of God to mankind *necessarily* require to be made in writing, we cannot even conjecture: this, however, we know, that the original revelation to our first parents, and the patriarchs, was *not made in writing*. What certainly seems *monstrous* is that any *inspired documents* of revelation, having been prepared by *miracle*, should bear no unquestionable proofs of the miracle that produced them:—that not even the natural and obvious means of convincing mankind of their authenticity, and their exemption from corruption and interpolation—such means as the printing press would have afforded—should have been observed by a providence so profuse in supernatural operations, as it is represented by Divines. Most of all it is *monstrous* to suppose that the Revelations of God, committed to writings of high antiquity, partly in Hebrew, a dead language of which no perfect knowledge can ever be acquired,—partly in Greek, in a dialect which though made up of Greek words, has scarcely anything in common with the notions and mental forms preserved in the writings which are our most abundant as well as most effectual means of understanding the Greek language—it is monstrous, we repeat, to suppose that God, having committed his Revelations to such writings, should leave Christians to guess which of the various meanings they convey *is* his own *revelation*, and which are poisonous, soul-killing errors. This is the true *monster* in the question:—a monster, indeed, which for ages has produced and nourished another—the living Oracle of the Church of Rome.

The natural and inevitable inference from these undeniable truths is, that the Revelations which God has made to mankind cannot be of that kind which would be *frustrated* for want of a *miraculous* certainty, either in regard to their origin, or their meaning. Let Divines open their eyes to a truth of indescribable importance: it is this;—To make Christianity consist in a revelation, which is not, cannot be, a revelation, except in combination with a *miraculous interpreter* of it, is to condemn Christianity altogether. Since it is a *fact* that such an interpreter does not exist, and, on the generally-received hypothesis, Christianity cannot exist without him, the rejection of the Gospel is reduced by Divines to a direct consequence of a palpable *fact*.

That this overwhelming demonstration should not strike all Christians who are able to think, is the effect of the perfectly idolatrous feeling in which piously educated people are brought up, in regard to the Bible. It would be vain to attempt the conviction of minds subdued by that superstitious notion which represents the Deity as dwelling in the printed words of the Bible. But as some of the persons brought up in that habitual feeling may still have courage to consider impartially what has here been said, we will endeavour to remove some obstacles which must lie in the way of their recovering a truly Christian freedom.

There is no passage more likely to rise up like a terrifying phantom before them than the well-known words of St. Paul to Timothy :* "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." We will not insist against the illogical process of making the Scripture attest its own inspiration. We would, however, in the first place, lead the unsuperstitious reader to observe how the preconceived notions of the translators have pressed the sense of the Greek passage into their service. The Greek word *θεόπνευστος* is not only figurative, but may possibly represent *two* opposite figures: something *breathed out by* God; and something *breathing out* God. Whether, by some over-refined criticism, the Greek word may be confined to the first signification, we will not stop to ascertain: but if so, it would be curious that such an important assertion as that which the passage is supposed to convey, should depend on a recondite grammatical knowledge.† But we are not disposed to dispute that the Hebrew Scriptures (for it must not be forgotten that St. Paul speaks of those Scriptures which Timothy knew "from a child") may be truly said to be *breathed* by God, i. e. to have arisen by means of the peculiar providence which superintended the moral education of the Jewish people; and much less will we deny the unquestionable fact, that those Scriptures *breathe out God*, i. e. godliness or piety—though the piety they breathe is not unfrequently mixed

* 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.

† This word may be like that class of compounds in *os*, such as *μητροκτονος*, *θεοτοκος*, which change their signification from active to passive, as the accent is changed from the penult to the antepenult. It will be very difficult to prove the contrary. It is true, as far as our observation carries us, that most of such words are derived from middle preterits. But since such derivatives from the passive form as *ἄπνευστος*, *εὔπνευστος*, are translated *he that breathes not*; *he that breathes well*, the supposition that *θεοπνευστος* might be translated *Deum spirans*, he that breathes God, or, as we should say, *breathes of God*, may be not well grounded, but cannot be absurd. This is enough for our argument. This view is supported by Schultess of Zurich.

up with the gross and carnal feelings of which Jesus accuses the Jewish nation; with that "hardness of heart" to which he expressly attributes the imperfections of Moses' laws. In the next place, we request the serious attention of the reader to the nature of the recommendations which St. Paul bestows on the Hebrew Scriptures. 1. Those Scriptures had the power to make Timothy (a Jew) wise unto salvation, through *that* faith which is in Christ Jesus. That the Hebrew Scriptures were so ordained by Providence as to lead the upright, candid, and virtuous Jews to the Christ, we freely grant. That they were intended to produce the same effect upon the minds of all men, is an assertion without foundation. 2. Those Scriptures are profitable for teaching (διδασκαλίαν). The Jews had, indeed, no other *national* means of instruction. 3. The Hebrew Scriptures are profitable for reproof (ἔλεγχον): and, unquestionably, to a Jew, as long as the polity existed, (in compliance with which Paul had circumcised Timothy, not for any value which Paul himself set on circumcision, but "because of the Jews,"*) the Hebrew Scriptures were the standard by which the conduct of every member of that nation who had not arrived at the full, conscientious conviction of the abolition of the Law, through the Christ, should be judged. 4. The Hebrew Scriptures are profitable for correction (ἐπανόρθωσιν); *repairing of faults, setting right again.* This is a declaration almost identical with the preceding one. 5. The Hebrew Scriptures are profitable for instruction (παιδείαν; elementary instruction) in righteousness (δικαιοσύνη), i. e. the correct conduct of a Jew. This more rhetorical than philosophical enumeration concludes with a sentence which, in general terms, expresses the final end of the advantages presented by the Scriptures to a pious Jew; namely, that the man of God† (i. e. a man whose life is devoted to the object of spreading the principles and sentiments of piety, like the ancient prophets,) may be *competent* (ἄρτιος), thoroughly furnished (fitted out, ἐξηρτισμένος) for every good work (i. e. every duty of his office).

When the utmost shall have been done to increase the significancy of every part of this passage, let us see whether it can support the common notions of inspiration, as they appear *practically* among us. Suppose any one denies the literal meaning of the first chapters of Genesis: we instantly hear an indignant cry against the impiety of such a view. But why? Has St. Paul given us any rule to ascertain to which of the senses of every passage of the Hebrew Scripture it is that the word θεόπνευστος

* Acts xvi. 3. † Comp. 1 Sam. ix. 6.; 1 Kings xiii. 6; 2 Kings i. 9.

applies? And, since he has not, is not that omission a proof that the word which the English version so freely translates "the inspiration of God" means only a *collective* derivation from God, which leaves the Christian mind at liberty to expound or reject individual passages, so as to prevent their opposing the *original divine light of our reason*, purified by the *light and spirit* of the Gospel? Where is the clear title of any man to accuse another of impiety, because he uses his intellectual liberty? Were there a judge of the sense of Scripture divinely appointed—were that appointment so made as to allow of no reasonable doubt—to act against his decisions would deserve the condemnation to which clear offences against God are justly liable. That, since we have been left to judge of the sense of Scripture for ourselves, every man should adhere to what he conscientiously finds in them, is perfectly just; that, since he thinks himself right, he must also think others wrong, is inevitable; but to come with a text of Scripture in hand, and show it as a clear title to charge another man with sin and impiety; to declare him out of the pale of salvation, because he either rejects the text, as *human*, or explains it in a sense which does not suit him that makes the charge, is a most unchristian presumption.

The *Hebrew Scriptures* have the sanction of Christ and his Apostles, as *such*; i. e. as writings prepared through the especial providence of God for the benefit of the Jewish people, according to the circumstances of that nation, and in reference to a higher divine dispensation, i. e. the Gospel: consequently, they deserve a reverent study on the part of every Christian, according to his individual means and powers. But the value of those Scriptures is only in reference to the Gospel. As far as the Providence which caused their existence intended them for us, they must be designed to promote in each individual the sincere and hearty acceptance of the Christ, as the representative of God in respect to mankind. With what colour then of reason can it be supposed, that it is God's will we should receive those books in such a sense and manner that, in regard to millions of candid and well-disposed individuals, they must necessarily prevent belief in Christ? Such a supposition can only proceed from that fatal notion which represents Faith as a sacrifice of reason, and measures the value of that Faith by the amount and extent of the sacrifice. What absurdity so monstrous as to be excluded by such Faith?

The New Testament, infinitely superior as it is to the Old, has not—cannot have—any recommendation from the Christ and his Apostles: the reason is obvious, the collection to which we give that name was not made till after their death. To demand,

therefore, the acknowledgment of *oracular infallibility* for every passage, as a necessary condition of Christianity, is a most unjust assumption. The value of the New Testament cannot be disparaged by any one who has in his heart even the smallest principle of the Spirit of the Christ—that Spirit of which the New Testament is the faithful and abundant repository. If any one does not discover that divine Spirit there, if by the study of those records he does not find his love of the Christ increased, his prayer for Christian purity more ardent and constant, his love of mankind more active and sincere—he is certainly not one of the Christ's disciples—"he is none of his." But what has this to do with the *oracular certainty of every passage*? Or how can the temper of mind just described exist in conjunction with the domineering spirit, which, *in the name of Scripture*, demands submission from the understanding of other men?

We have spoken of the Bible in language so different from that to which most people are accustomed, that it becomes a duty to add a clear and distinct declaration that we acknowledge the Bible as the highest *authority* on religious matters. We acknowledge that the same Providence which from the creation of man prepared the way to the Gospel of Christ, intended that the Jewish Scriptures should eminently contribute towards this great final object. Convinced, by natural means, of the *general* authenticity of the New Testament, we feel the same reverence for the recorded words of Christ, where there is no strong ground to doubt their genuineness, as if we heard them from his lips. In a similar manner, though not in the same degree, we are ready to be taught, in things directly relating to the Spirit of Christ, by his Apostles, especially by John and Paul. But all divine addresses to man must presuppose the existence of his reason—and as all such addresses are directly made to the intelligent part of our being, we cannot renounce the use of that reason, when we are employed in searching the meaning of words ever so directly divine. Since God, in the instruction of mankind, employs human language, addressed to the origin of all language—human reason—we are bound, indeed we cannot avoid it, to consult our reason as to the meaning of that language. If we had been clearly and unquestionably directed to submit to some living interpreter, we would put our own reason into his keeping; but since no such interpreter has been appointed, the primitive and natural appointment of our Reason to be our own guide, remains in full power and validity.

Let every one judge *for himself*. Every one may lawfully explain and recommend his own convictions to others; but upon matters which are clearly left to individual judgment,—and such

is the authenticity and the meaning of the whole and of every part of Scripture,—no man should condemn any rejection or interpretation *as criminal,* though he certainly has a right to declare it *erroneous.*

Art. V.—TRANSLATIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The New Testament, translated from Griesbach's text. By Samuel Sharpe. The Second Edition. London: 1844.

The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, revised from the Authorized Version with the aid of other translations, and made conformable to the Greek text of J. J. Griesbach. By a Layman. London: 1840.

It must be considered as one of the strange accidents of literature that one of these works has reached a Second Edition, whilst the other has received but little attention. Without professing to review as it deserves the Layman's *Revision*, we shall first bring it into comparison with Mr. Sharpe's *Translation* in connection with some of the points observed upon in our notice of the First Edition,—and then examine it more generally. Mr. Sharpe has shown himself, in many respects, not inattentive to criticism, and therefore we presume that he maintains, after deliberate reconsideration, the accuracy and taste of some translations whose incorrectness and infelicity we then lamented.

I. In regard to the *Article*, Mr. Sharpe perseveres in translating out of Greek but not into English. "Neither do men light a lamp and put it under *the* bushel." Matt. v. 15. "He hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by *a* man whom he hath ordained." Acts xvii. 31. For this last there is no excuse, since the word translated '*ordained*' really means '*marked out definitely*.' Neither in this violation of idioms is Mr. Sharpe guided by any universal Rule,—for most of the other cases to which we formerly objected he has altered in this Second Edition.

II. There are numerous instances in which we should not deem it worth while to notice the false translation were it not for the false taste of the departure from "the beautiful simplicity of the Authorized Version," which Mr. Sharpe professes never to "change for changing's sake." 1. "Angels came *up*, and ministered unto him." Matt. iv. 11. Angels are generally conceived as coming *down*: but in this case the Greek says only that they *approached*,—or simply, as the Received Version and the Layman have it, that, 'they came and ministered unto him.' No doubt when people are travelling the same road, and some are rereward or left behind, 'coming up' and 'approaching' are synonymous, but these were not the circumstances of the Angelic visitants.

2. "Swear not at all, neither by Heaven, for it is God's throne; nor by the earth, for it is *a footstool of his feet*,"—neither by Jerusalem, for it is the great King's city." Matt. v. 34. In the last clause Mr. Sharpe has restored the definite Article, but managed to destroy the solemnity of the words. 'The great king's city,' is not an equivalent expression to "the city of the great king,"—and 'a footstool of his feet' is a weak dilution of 'his footstool,'—a mere literal *rendering*, serving none of the purposes of a *translation*. If this is not 'change for changing's sake,' what law of taste or grammar required it?

3. "And the men marvelled, saying, 'What is this man, that even the winds and the sea obey him?'" The Received Version and the Layman translate correctly, 'What *manner* of man is this, &c.,'—and Mr. Sharpe has again we think changed for the worse, "for changing's sake."

4. "And when Jesus came into the ruler's house and saw the *pipers*," &c. Matt. ix. 23.

III. There are some translations not only of a faulty, and, to us we confess, of a painful character, in which, though he has altered the most of those to which we formerly objected, Mr. Sharpe still deliberately perseveres.

1. "And why seest thou the chaff that is in thy brother's eye, but perceivest not the splinter that is in thine own eye?" Matt. vii. 3. Who can think of this without suffering torture: a splinter in his eye, and not perceive it? The word does not signify a *splinter*, but a *beam*, the *whole* beam of timber,—and never was a figure more abused. The figure of the whole *beam* in the eye by its very enormity and physical impossibility excites no pain, and brings out the full contrast between a slight defect and a total and blinding corruption,—whilst the 'splinter' is agonizing in itself, and does *not* express the contrast. Chaff and splinters are things that might be brought into comparison. We know not what can be the attractions of this excruciating word *splinter*, that have induced even the Layman to take it in preference, not indeed to *the beam*, but contrariwise to the *mote* of the Received Version. Strange that Mr. Sharpe should use the word '*splinter*' to express the whole tree, and that the Layman should use it to express the smallest imaginable atom of it! Clearly the Layman is right so far as the meaning of words is concerned,—but why alter so painfully the perfect translation of the Common Version?

2. 'And they found a difficulty in him.' Matt. xiii. 57.—'And they were offended at him.'—*Layman*. Mr. Sharpe's rendering is neither English, nor conveys a clear meaning, nor is yet a literal translation of the Greek word.

3. 'And they stripped him and put on him a scarlet soldier's-cloak.' Matt. xxvii. 28. This is barbarous in sound, and evidently incorrect. Mark distinctly states that it was "the purple" they put upon him. Matthew uses the word χλαμυς. "They put on him the crimson [or purple] robe of kings,"—to mock his kingly dignity.

IV. There are some miscellaneous passages, which we cannot class under any of the preceding heads, to his former translation of which Mr. Sharpe still adheres.

1. "In likewise the Spirit also helpeth our weaknesses; for we know not what we should pray for as we ought; but the Spirit itself intercedeth for us with *unspoken groans.* And he who searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, that it intercedeth with God for the Saints."—Rom. viii. 26, 27. We doubt whether it is possible for any one to understand this passage, and translate it as Mr. Sharpe has done. The Layman, following the Received Version, translates correctly, though certainly not happily. Why should the *sighings* of the spiritual mind after undefined good continue to be called *groanings?*

"And the Spirit also helpeth our weaknesses: for we know not what to pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself intercedeth for us, in groanings which cannot be expressed. And he who searcheth the heart knoweth what the mind of the Spirit is, that it intercedeth in behalf of the saints, according to the will of God."—*Layman's Revision.* Blanco White has admirably expressed the sentiment of this passage. "Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities; for we know not what we should pray for as we ought; but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with sighs not expressed in words; that is, the divine impulse after holiness that is in us, makes us sigh for what we cannot express: but God, who gives us that Spirit, knows what it is we wish for."—*Heresy and Orthodoxy, Second Edition, p.* 72.

2. 1 Tim. iii. 15, 16. Mr. Sharpe has altered the pointing and translation of this passage given in his first Edition. Both he and the Layman depart from Griesbach's punctuation, though Mr. Sharpe gives no notice of the departure. "These things write I unto thee, hoping to come to thee shortly; but if I tarry, that thou mayest know how to behave in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, as a pillar and support of the truth. And confessedly great is the mystery of Godliness; who was made manifest in flesh, justified in spirit, seen by preachers, proclaimed among the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up in glory."—*Sharpe's Transla-*

tion. "These things I write unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly: but if I delay, *then* that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God,—which is the church of the living God,—as a pillar and support of the truth. And confessedly great is the mystery of godliness: He who was manifested in the flesh, was justified in the Spirit, seen by angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."—*Layman's Revision.* A *Mystery* is a Doctrine expressed by Emblems, Symbols, and Embodiments. It is in this sense, we think that, in this passage, the Christ is said to be the Mystery, representation or impersonation, the embodied Doctrine, of Godliness, shown in the flesh, vindicated in spiritual power by the resurrection, seen by angels, proclaimed among the Gentiles, believed on in the world, taken up into glory."

3. 1 John iii. 15. "Herein we have known his love," &c.—*Sharpe.* The Layman gives the true meaning. "Hereby we know *love*" (amoris naturam), "because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren."

4. John xix. 26, 27. Both Mr. Sharpe and the Layman, following the Common Version, turn Nominatives into Accusatives, and destroy the force, the broken and ejaculatory character, of the passage. "Woman! behold!—thy Son! Behold!—thy Mother!" These surely are points to which new translators should have attended.

There is a passage in which Mr. Sharpe has departed from his first Edition, and we think for the worse.

5. Hebrews xi. 1. "Now faith is a confidence of things hoped for, a conviction of things unseen."—*Sharpe.* "Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." We incline to think that the Layman has had a true discernment of the force of this passage, which prevented any alteration of the received Version. We believe that St. Paul meant to call *faith* the *evidence* of invisible things, God's intimation to man of all that lies beyond the world of the senses,—and that the alteration of this, by a metonomy, to *persuasion,* or *conviction,* has arisen out of that philosophy which would reduce our belief in divine things to a process of logic, or to external experience,—and assign no conclusive force to the *belief itself.*

There is a passage in the Epistle to the Romans in which both Mr. Sharpe and the Layman depart from the Common Version, and in which, it appears to us, they have mistaken the force and construction of the original words. Rom. iv. 11, 12. "He received the sign of circumcision,——that he might be

the father of all who believed through uncircumcision,——and the father of circumcision, *not only* to those who are of circumcision, but to those who walk in the steps of the faith of our father Abraham, which he had while in uncircumcision."—*Sharpe.* The Layman's translation is better in every respect, except in the italicised words. "He received the sign of circumcision,——that he might become the father of all those who believe, though they be uncircumcised,——and the father of circumcision *not only* to those who are of the circumcision, but to those also who walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised."—*Layman's Revision.* St. Paul wished to say that the true circumcision was that of the heart, which Abraham had, and of which the outward circumcision was only the *sign*,—that therefore those who had the *reality* were Abraham's spiritual lineage, whether they had the sign or not,—and those who had not the reality were not his children, though they had the sign. The Received Version translates the 12th verse correctly:—He is "the father of circumcision, to those who are not the circumcised only [barely], but who *also walk in the steps* of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised."

We do not profess to have carefully examined every part of the second edition of Mr. Sharpe's translation. We have chiefly compared it with our strictures on the first. But as we found much to commend then, we can safely say, that it is now a vastly superior work. Wherever we have looked into it, we have seen signs of careful revision, and though we have found reason to reiterate our objections to some of his renderings, numerous blemishes have been removed,—and the translation may be profitably consulted by those who know how to use it. We cannot say that it approaches yet to a standard, either of correctness or taste.

We break through no concealment that there is any longer a desire to observe, when we say that the late Mr. Edgar Taylor is the author of the Layman's Revision. It is not a little strange, and not a little creditable to Mr. Sharpe and Mr. Taylor, that two laymen, in habitual intercourse with each other, should, in mutual ignorance of the fact, be engaged in a task so honourable and laborious, and so little likely to receive either remuneration or appreciation from the world. Mr. Taylor may be said to have died with his work in his hands. By no other interest or labour could a scholar and a Christian have more worthily sustained the weakness, weariness, and pain of a lingering death. As he says himself, with touching pathos, it was a loved resource, "in which the weary spirit was glad to find relief under its

burdens; and where better than in lingering by the fountains of living waters?" The work is executed with exemplary fidelity, judgment, and taste; and since the authorized version must be the basis of all English translations, it is, we think, by far the most perfect form in which the New Testament exists in our language.

In one point, of much importance, Mr. Taylor has, with excellent judgment, departed from the Common Version. By always translating the same words in the same way, in parallel connections, in his Revision of the Gospels, he has enabled even the English reader to be, in some respect, a partaker in the interest of the controversy respecting the correspondence, and common origin of the three first Gospels. On this question, as Mr. Taylor remarks in his preface, "*our* version seems based on a studied design to confound and mislead as to the actual facts."

In this Revision, whilst the translation which most commended itself to the writer's judgment is given in the text, in all doubtful or difficult cases the various renderings of which the passage appeared susceptible to competent authorities are given in the foot-notes. In this way the reader has before him at once, in all critical cases, the version of Wynne, Newcome, Wakefield, Boothroyd, Granville Penn, Campbell, Macknight, and Stuart. No doubt this is not strictly a part of a translator's duty,—and there is a danger of the distinct provinces of translator and interpreter being confused; but a translator must always be an interpreter to some considerable extent, unless he translates without any regard to the sense: and although before an unlearned reader the materials of judgment are not placed by this citation of various authorities, still it is useful knowledge to be aware that the doubt exists,—and to the Student it may serve the important purpose of bringing before him at one view all the renderings deserving of consideration, some of which are derived from sources not generally accessible. Indeed, though the plan pursued has the effect of presenting much exegetical matter, it preserves the Reviser from much of the responsibility of interpretation, by furnishing the reader with every rendering, different from his own, which a more extended biblical knowledge would have presented to him as worthy of a careful examination. In other cases the notes supply some of the uses of a Lexicon, and give the various meanings which the word *may* have in the particular connection. All this is evidence of great impartiality, and to the majority of readers must be highly convenient.

We shall now give some specimens, indiscriminately taken, of Mr. Taylor's revisions.

1. He very properly, in the first chapter of St. John's Gospel,

speaks of the Logos as *it*, until it is distinctly said to be incarnated in the Christ. Mr. Sharpe not only does this, but also in the eleventh and subsequent verses speaks of the Light not as embodied in Christ, but as *it*,—notwithstanding that such rendering connects a masculine pronoun with a neuter antecedent.

In the 14th verse there are some words unnecessarily supplied: "And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten *who came* from the Father,) full of grace and truth."

2. Mr. Taylor corrects the error in the 21st verse, into which King James's translators evidently fell in consequence of their using the Latin version as their original. The Vulgate supplied, as its best resource, the Greek article by the Latin *ille*. Hence in this verse our Version has, "Art thou *that* Prophet?" which is only a repetition of the former question, 'Art thou Elijah?' instead of 'art thou the Prophet?' We have the same correction in Mr. Sharpe.

3. We can perceive no reason for the unrhythmical alteration of the well-known "I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness," into, 'I am the voice of one crying *out* in the desert.'

4. There is a very awkward form of words in the 33rd verse. "And I had not known him: but that he who sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, &c." The Received Version is much more suggestive of the true meaning, that he had no previous knowledge of his Messiahship, until the *sign*, which had been communicated to him, attached itself to Jesus. "And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost."

5. John ii. 10. Here the Reviser has departed from his Standard Version without any justification from the original, and certainly with no advantage either of sound or sense. "Every man setteth on the best wine first: and worse *wine* afterwards, when men have drunk a good deal; *but* thou hast kept the best wine until now."—*Layman.* "Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine; and when men have well drunk, then that which is worse: *but* thou hast kept the good wine until now." It is one of the chief merits of the Received Version, that it does not excite vulgar associations even with the most common and least sacred things. Many such alterations as this, and they are not unfrequent, would render it impossible for the Layman's Revision to be taken into public use, whatever might be its merits of fidelity in particular passages.

6. John ii. 16, 17. In this passage the quotation from the Psalm is newly rendered, with excellent effect. "'Take these things hence! make not my Father's house a house of traffic.' And his disciples remembered that it was written, 'A zeal for thy house consumeth me.'" Yet why make an abatement in this improvement by the needless alteration of 'merchandize' into '*traffic*,' in a passage so familiarly quoted that any change, even a needed one, must be difficult and painful? In similar taste is the change in the 20th verse, of, 'Forty and six years was this temple in building, &c.' into the colloquialism of "forty-six years hath this temple been in building." Here the literal translation conveys the very idea of *length* of time which it was the speaker's intention to produce.

7. John iv. 21. There is here a change in the collocation of the words, which conveys a meaning different from that suggested by the original,—that the worship of the Father should no more be either on Zion or Gerizim, but in spirit and in truth. "The hour cometh, when ye shall worship the Father neither on this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem;—the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth."—*Layman's Revision.* "The hour cometh when ye shall, neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father.—The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth."

8. John vii. 37, 38. This is an example of a most judicious and desirable revision. It gives its true force to a spiritual sentiment which in our translation is only a revolting absurdity. What could induce Mr. Sharpe to leave this passage as he found it, whilst he has altered so much that needed no alteration? "If any one thirst, let him come unto me, and drink. He that believeth in me, as the Scripture hath said, from within him shall flow rivers of living water."—*Layman's Revision.* "He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.—*Received Version.*

9. John xiii. 10. Here the original uses two words for *bathing* and *washing*, where the Layman and the Received Version use but one. The meaning is certainly brought out in the Layman's revision in the first clause,—but this is a case where good taste would have preserved the somewhat indistinct rendering of our common translation in the second clause. "He that is washed [*bathed*] needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit."—*Received Version.* "He that hath been washed needeth not to wash more than his feet, he is then clean all over."—*Layman.*

10. John xiii. 21. What could be the temptation to the following insipid and elliptical rendering: 'Verily I say unto you, one of you will *deliver me up*' [betray me]. Again in the 30th verse, after again and again rendering the same word by *sop*, where could the inducement come from to employ the almost ludicrous form of expression: "he then having received *the morsel* went immediately out." How much more solemn and forcible, and correct too, is the rendering of the Common Version, of the words immediately following, ἦν δὲ νύξ, "*and it was night*," than the dilution, 'Now it was then night.'

11. John xviii. 38. There is great skill and address in the manner in which Mr. Taylor has preserved the force of this passage by the simple change of '*heareth*' in the Received Version, into '*hearkeneth*.' "Every one that is of the truth *hearkeneth* to my voice,"—and so becomes a member of his spiritual *kingdom*.

12. Romans ii. 20.—"An instructor of the simple, a teacher of babes, possessest in the law the form of knowledge and of truth." There is probably a misprint here of possessest for *possessing*,—but the point we would observe upon in the passage is the doubtful expression '*form* of knowledge.' Such expressions in our version as, "having a *form* of godliness," have fixed an association of pretence and unrealness with the word. But such an association should not attend it in this passage, and it would have been better to have used the word 'delineation,' or 'representation,' as Stuart does.

13. Romans v. 3. "Affliction worketh patience;"—more than patience, *perseverance*. In this same passage there is a very faulty punctuation, different from that of Griesbach: "and this hope maketh us not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts, by *the* Holy spirit, which is given unto us." The love of God, *actually given* and existing in the heart, was the pledge that the *hope* would not be shamed by disappointment. Here a revision of the Common Version would have been an advantage.

14. Romans vii. 1. "Know ye not, brethren, that the law hath dominion over a man only as long as he liveth?" This agrees with the received version, but appears to us to oppose the main design of St. Paul, to subject a man to the Law as long as he lived, and to destroy the illustration which aimed to show that if the Law was dead, fulfilled and superseded, the living man was free to form a new spiritual union. If this is not the meaning, there is no parallelism in the case adduced of the woman being bound by the law of the man, as long as he is a *living* man, but

loosed from the law of her husband, and free to enter into new wedlock, if he be dead.

15. Romans vii. 7. "I had not known the sin of lust, unless the law had said, 'Thou shalt not covet.'" In the times of James's translators the word 'lust' may have had the sense of 'cupidity' or 'covetousness,' but now it suggests a different meaning, and should be altered.

16. Romans vii. 9. "And I once lived without *knowledge of the* law: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died." This alteration of the Common Version seems to us to imply a misconception of the passage. "I was alive once," says St. Paul, "without the law,"—identifying himself with that state of the heart in which the sense of discord with a Law has not yet been excited; 'I was alive once, when the consciousness of sin was yet dead, and my life was a free, unburdened impulse, followed without check or sense of wrong; but the Commandment came to me, making known its requirements, and sin awakened up into conscious existence, and I died,—became spiritually wretched. My soul living in *unconscious* violation of law had more of the freedom and freshness, and even purity of moral life, than when the Law coming into visible existence exerted an ineffectual power, and only showed me that I was a transgressor.'

17. Romans vii. 21. "I find therefore *this* law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God according to the inward man: but I perceive another law in my members warring against the law of my mind, &c." This passage is a recapitulation of all St. Paul had previously said of the spiritual operation of Law, considered as an *outward* command. 'I find then *this* to be the sum or effect of Law, that when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I give my assent to [too strongly translated, *I delight in*] the law of God with my inward man, but I see another law in my members, &c.'

18. Romans viii. 15. "Ye have received a spirit of adoption, by virtue of which we cry Abba, *that is,* Father." Why not say at once, "the spirit of *sonship*?" '*Adoption*' not only fails to convey the true meaning, but suggests a false one. It is not as *adopted* sons that the Gospel connects us with God.

19. Romans ix. 10. "And not *she* only: but when Rebecca also had conceived, &c." We think the Received Version is correct here: 'And not only *this*.' The meaning is, that God restricted the promise first to *Sarah's* son,—and once again to Rebecca's younger son,—so that the seed of Abraham was only in the line of Isaac, and again only in *one* branch of that line.

"Neither because they are the seed of Abraham are they all children of the promise,—but in *Isaac* shall thy seed be called,—and not this *only*, but,"—of the line of Isaac, the children of promise are in the branch of Jacob only.

20. 1 Cor. iii 10. "Ye are the tillage of God, the building of God." The force of the Apostle's argument, that there was to be no 'glory' or 'strife' about *men*, because God himself was working in them, is better preserved in the Common Version: "Ye are God's husbandry, *ye are* God's building."

21. 1 Cor. xii. 7. "The manifestation of the spirit is given to each for *that which is* profitable."—*Layman.* The spirit of the Apostle's argument requires, and the Greek word admits, that we should translate—'The manifestation of the spirit is given to each for the collective (general) good'—πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον.

22. 1 Cor. xiii. 12. "For now we see as through a glass darkly." This, which is the common version, is a very imperfect rendering of the original. "For now we see but through a mirror, in shadowy forms."

23. 2 Cor. v. 1. "For we know that if our earthly house of *this* tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, everlasting in the heavens."—*Layman.* We doubt whether most readers attach any distinct meaning to the strange expression, "the earthly house of *this* tabernacle." St. Paul calls our body 'this earthly tent-house.' Montgomery introduces the image into one of his most exquisite hymns:—

> 'Here in the body pent,
> Absent from him I roam;
> Yet nightly pitch my moving tent
> A day's march nearer home.'

24. 2 Cor. iv. 1, 2. "Wherefore seeing that we have received this ministry, according as we have obtained mercy, we faint not; but have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, &c."

The expression of the absolute confidence in which Paul commits himself to the simplicity of the Gospel is obscured by the phrase, 'the hidden things of dishonesty,' which very imperfectly conveys the real meaning, namely, that concealment of Truth which may result from a want of moral courage. The sentiment and indeed the word are the same which occur in the Epistle to the Romans in a similar connection: "I am not *ashamed* of the Gospel of Christ." "Seeing, then, that we have received this ministry, as we have obtained mercy we faint not, but have renounced the concealments of shame [timidity]."

25. 2 Cor. vi. 12. "O Corinthians, our mouth is opened unto you, our heart is enlarged: ye are not straitened in us, but ye

are straitened in your own bowels." Surely this is a passage which a Reviser should have restored to the English reader. "O ye Corinthians,—ye are not straitened in us,—but in your own affections." This rendering is given in the note,—but why, in so palpable a case, not take it into the text?

26. Matt. vi. 22. "The lamp of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be clear, the whole body will be full of light; but if thine eye be dim, thy whole body will be full of darkness." This rendering destroys the double reference, made in the original, to the bodily and the mental eye. The translation is not literal, and takes away one half of the meaning.

27. Luke ii. 49. "How is it that ye sought me? Knew ye not that I must be in my Father's house?" We do not perceive the necessity or the desirableness of this change, though we are aware it is supported by high authorities. The article is in the plural, and it is exceedingly unlikely that a plural noun for 'house,' or 'temple,' should be understood. When in the fourth Gospel Jesus speaks of his Father's house, he says, *τον οἶκον τοῦ πατρὸς μου*.

We should be committing injustice if we did not add, that it is much easier to single out some remaining imperfections, as we deem them, in this Revision, than to give any adequate conception of the extent of its pains-taking and fidelity. The emendations, for the most part, are not of a kind to be exhibited for effect, and are only to be ascertained and duly estimated by a constant use of the work. To convey a true idea of its improvements we should have to quote something from every page of the book. It should be remembered, moreover, that Mr. Taylor did not live to see his work through the press, and that his able Editor did not feel himself at liberty to make any changes in the version. Though thus deprived of the author's last superintendence, and of that best of revisions which the eye and the mind together make upon the printed page, still we repeat that it is by far the most perfect form in which the New Testament exists in the English language. It is disgraceful to the Church of England that she never has undertaken a thorough Revision of the Authorized Version;—but the Church of England is dead, without a Government, without *living* guidance or direction, and she dare not call one into being. What are we to think of a Supreme Church that has no living voice of authority, individual or collective,—no power to correct an error, or remove an evil? Such is the Church of England, unable to reform her own Service, to restrain her own Schismatics,—without power to revise her own Liturgy or Articles, and with no thoughts of serving Religion in this country by publishing the Scriptures in a true form.

Art. VI.—THE CLAIMS OF LABOUR.

An Essay on the Duties of the Employers to the Employed. By the Author of Essays written in the Intervals of Business. London: 1844.

Visiting Societies and Lay Readers: A Letter to the Lord Bishop of London. By Presbyter Catholicus. London: 1844.

This work has been well described as written in a spirit of serene and elevated common-place. Its maxims are most sound, its spirit most wise and just, but its contribution to the *Dynamics* of the great social problems it treats of, to the *means* and *forces* of their practical, or practicable, solution, — nothing. Indeed the highest encomium that can be passed on the author and his Essay, and it is no mean one, is, that strong and fervent must have been the feeling in his own mind, of duty and the brotherly claims of his fellow-men, to induce him to write out sentiments which were pressing on his moral sensibilities, though he had but little to say but what others had already said to him, and nothing to suggest of the administrative or operative measures by which such sentiments might be made effective. The chief value of the work, accordingly, is in the right spirit towards all in dependent situations which it inculcates, and admirably expresses. It is excellently written, and it is hardly possible for any one seriously to peruse it without rising a better, and so far a wiser man. It makes no claim to originality, but yet states social relations and the responsibilities which arise out of them, with a force and distinctness which not many minds can bring to bear even on their most ordinary interests, and from which he must have a very hard or a very easy conscience who can altogether escape. There are many well-known truths, and admitted sentiments, of that kind which Coleridge describes "as *so* true, that they lose all the power of truth, and lie bed-ridden in the dormitory of the soul," here "rescued from neglect," and endued with "freshness and importance," by "*reflecting* on them in direct reference to our own state and conduct." We shall give some analysis of this Essay, chiefly for the sake of transferring to our pages some passages of thoughtful and conscientious wisdom, livingly expressed. Its professed object is to show what can be done by the Employers of labour in their individual and private capacity, and at the

outset endeavours to create a sense of the vast importance of their social position.

"What an important relation is that of Master and Man! How it pervades the world; ascending from the lowest gradation of planter and slave through the states of master and servant, landlord and labourer, manufacturer and artisan, till it comes to the higher degrees of rule which one cultivated man has to exercise over another in the performance of the greatest functions. See, throughout, what difficulties and temptations encumber this relation. How boundless is the field of thought which it opens to us, how infinite the duties which it contains, how complete an exercise it is for the whole faculties of man. Observe what wretchedness is caused by a misunderstanding of this relation in domestic matters. See the selfish carelessness about the happiness of those around them, of men not ill-intentioned, nor unkind, perhaps, in their dealings with the world in general, but lamentably unfit for the management of a home. Then observe the effects of similar mismanagement in dealing with a country. Look at the listless loiterers about an Irish town: you would naturally say to yourself, 'Surely this people have done all that there can be for them to do.' You walk out of the town, and find the adjacent fields as listless-looking, and neglected, as the men themselves. Think what a want there must be of masters of labour, that those hands and these weeds are not brought into closer contact."

Before treating of the Duties of the great Employers of labour, the Essay states the more private claims of domestic servants.

"That, in this case, the employer and the employed are members of one family, is a circumstance which intensifies the relation. It is a sad thing for a man to pass the working part of his day with an exacting, unkind master: but still, if the workman returns at evening to a home that is his own, there is a sense of coming joy and freedom which may support him throughout the weary hours of labour. But think what it must be to share one's home with one's oppressor; to have no recurring time when one is certain to be free from those harsh words and unjust censures, which are almost more than blows, aye, even to those natures we are apt to fancy so hardened to rebuke. Imagine the deadness of heart that must prevail in that poor wretch who never hears the sweet words of praise or of encouragement. Many masters of families, men living in the rapid current of the world, who are subject to a variety of impressions which, in their busy minds, are made and effaced even in the course of a single day, can with difficulty estimate the force of unkind words upon those whose monotonous life leaves

few opportunities of effacing any unwelcome impression. There is nothing in which the aid of imagination, that handmaid of charity, may be more advantageously employed, than in considering the condition of domestic servants. Let a man endeavour to realize it to himself, let him think of its narrow sphere, of its unvarying nature, and he will be careful not to throw in, unnecessarily, the trouble even of a single harsh word, which may make so large a disturbance in the shallow current of a domestic's hopes and joys. How often, on the contrary, do you find that masters seem to have no apprehension of the feelings of those under them, no idea of any duties on their side beyond 'cash payment,' whereas the good, old, patriarchal feeling towards your household is one which the mere introduction of money wages has not by any means superseded, and which cannot, in fact, be superseded."——

"Another mode of viewing with charity the conduct of domestic servants, is to imagine what manner of servant you would make yourself, or any one of those whom in your own rank you esteem and love. Do you not perceive in almost every character, some element which would occasionally make its possessor fail in performing the duties of domestic service? Do you find that faithfulness, accuracy, diligence, and truth pervade the circle of your equals in such abundance that you should be exorbitantly angry, the moment you perceive a deficiency in such qualities amongst those who have been but indifferently brought up, and who, perhaps, have early imbibed those vices of their class, fear and falsehood: vices which their employers can only hope to eradicate by a long course of considerate kindness."

In looking about for those from whom help may come towards the practical solution of the great question of 'Labour and its Claims,' the Author turns first to the 'Masters of Thought,' and asks whether the Poet will not 'do something to lift the burden of his own age.' The Poets of Labour have come from the labouring classes, except those who, like Channing and Carlyle, have spoken the deepest poetry in prose. Burns, Elliott, Nicol, Prince, and William Thom, are the poets of Toil, men whose thoughts, to use the expression of one of them, come out like red hot bolts of iron. One Aristocratic poet has given us Poetry for the People, but the very title betrays the Amateur, and the Lays fall far short of the reality and earnestness of the Poetry *by* the People. Yet the Poet who has thus described the Patience of the Poor, and taught Wealth and Ease to appreciate their virtues, has at least escaped the censure of our Author upon those who use their great gifts of Imagination and expres-

sion upon literary tinsel and vanity, and leave *Man,* the Poet's theme, neglected :

"When leisurely the man of ease
His morning's daily course begins,
And round him in bright circle sees
The comforts Independence wins,
He seems unto himself to hold
An uncontested natural right
In Life a volume to unfold
Of simple ever-new delight.

"And if, before the evening close,
The hours their rainbow wings let fall,
And sorrow shakes his bland repose,
And too continuous pleasures pall,
He murmurs, as if Nature broke
Some promise plighted at his birth,
In bending him beneath the yoke
Borne by the common sons of earth.

"*They* starve beside his plenteous board,
They halt behind his easy wheels,
But sympathy in vain affords
The sense of ills he never feels.
He knows he is the same as they,
A feeble piteous mortal thing,
And still expects that every day
Increase and change of bliss should bring.

"Therefore, when he is called to know
The deep realities of pain,
He shrinks, as from a viewless blow,
He writhes as in a magic chain :
Untaught that trial, toil, and care,
Are the great charter of his kind,
It seems disgrace for him to share
Weakness of flesh and human mind.

"Not so the People's honest child,
The field-flower of the open sky,
Ready to live while winds are wild,
Nor, when they soften, loth to die;
To him there never came the thought
That this his life was meant to be
A pleasure-house, where peace unbought
Should minister to pride or glee.

"You oft may hear him murmur loud
Against the uneven lots of Fate;
You oft may see him inly bowed
Beneath Affliction's weight on weight:—
But rarely turns he on his grief
A face of petulant surprise,
Or scorns whate'er benign relief
The hand of God or man supplies.

"Behold him on his rustic bed,
The unluxurious couch of need,
Striving to raise his aching head,
And sinking powerless as a reed:
So sick in both, he hardly knows
Which is his heart's or body's sore,
For the more keen his anguish grows
His wife and children pine the more.

"No search for him of dainty food,
But coarsest sustenance of life,—
No rest by artful quiet wooed,
But household cries and wants and strife;
Affection can at best employ
Her utmost of unhandy care,
Her prayers and tears are weak to buy
The costly drug, the purer air.

"Pity herself, at such a sight,
Might lose her gentleness of mien,
And clothe her form in angry might,
And as a wild despair be seen:
Did she not hail the lesson taught,
By this unconscious suffering boor,
To the high sons of lore and thought,
—The sacred Patience of the Poor.

"——This great endurance of each ill,
As a plain fact whose right or wrong
They question not, confiding still
That it shall last not overlong:
Willing, from first to last, to take
The mysteries of our life, as given,
Leaving the time-worn soul to slake
Its thirst in an undoubted Heaven."

Monckton Milnes.

The Author seems to have kept a common-place book, into

which he inserted any weighty maxim that occurred to him on the relations and conditions of private life. These he pours out with no connection, but that of their common subject,—and in consequence a considerable part of the work reads like a string of proverbs. Some of them contain shrewd and thoughtful remarks, tersely and transparently expressed. Here is a just observation of the long under-currents of dislike and enmity, before, at some trifling sore, they make open rupture.

"It is hard to judge about quarrels, for the points on which they openly break out have often no more to do with the real grounds of difference than the place of a battle with the cause of the war. Many a quarrel, after running for a long time underground, gushes forth with a vehemence that seems unaccountable; and it is difficult to divine what lands it has passed through in its hidden course. Any particular outbreak cannot safely be taken as an index of the general conduct of the parties towards each other."

If some one asks, as is not unlikely, what has all this to do with the claims of labour, we can only say that it has a connection with our temper towards dependents, and so forms a part of a very wide subject.

Labour in Factories is the particular form of employment which our author selects, for the sake of applying to it the moral principles he educes from the general relations of Master and Man. Under the head of 'The Mill,' many important suggestions are huddled upon the top of one another: ventilation and piece-work; the non-interference principle; the overworking of children, when under men who have an interest in the amount of their labour; and the proper times of labour,—whether holidays should be in whole days or half-days, follow one another with no other ligament than, "while we are talking of the Mill, it may be well to observe,"—or, "the next thing to be mentioned in connection with the Mill,"—or, "it will not be an inappropriate place for saying something,"—or, "to resume the subject of the Mill." All these connectives occur within five pages. The author's thoughts are like marbles in a bag,—round and polished, but separate entities that may come rolling out in any order. He is admirable in the expression of single thoughts; but for composition he lacks cement.

Here is an excellent observation on the kind of education that is chiefly needed by the children of Labour:—

"There is one maxim which those who superintend schools should ponder well; and that is, that the best things to be learnt are those which the children cannot be examined upon.

One cannot but fear that the masters will be apt to think school-proficiency all in all; and that the founders and supporters of schools will, occasionally, be tempted by vanity to take most interest in those things which give most opportunity for display. Yet the slightest inferiority of moral tone in a school would be ill compensated for by an expertness, almost marvellous, in dealing with figures; or a knowledge of names, things, and places, which may well confound the grown-up bystanders. That school would in reality be the one to be proud of, where order was thoroughly maintained with the least admixture of fear; where you would have most chance of meeting truthful replies from the children in a matter where such replies would criminate themselves, and where you would find the most kindly feeling to each other prevalent throughout. Yet these are things not to be done on show days, that cannot be got up for exhibition, that require unwearied supervision on the part of masters and benefactors, that will never be attempted but by those who, themselves, feel deeply the superiority of moral excellence to all else. Such teachers will see how the kindness of children to each other may be encouraged. They will take more notice of a good-natured thing than a clever one. They will show how much, even in the minutest trifles, truth and fortitude weigh with them. They will be careful not to stimulate an unwholesome craving for praise in their pupils. They will look not only to the thing done, but also to the mode and spirit of doing it. That this spirit and mode may be the means of generating and guiding future endeavours will be a main object with such instructors. The dignity of labour, the independence of thrift, the greatness of contentment, will be themes dwelt upon by them, in their loving foresight for the future welfare of the infant labourers entrusted to their care. To endear holy things to these little ones would delight such teachers far more than to instil the utmost proficiency in any critical or historical knowledge of the sacred writings. Not that the two things are in the least degree incompatible. Far from it, indeed! All I mean to insist on is, that such teachers will perceive what are the great objects of culture: and how subservient even the best knowledge is to the apprehension of duty. They will see, too, more clearly the necessity of bearing in mind the pre-eminence of moral and religious culture, when they reflect that many of their pupils come from places which cannot be called homes, where scarcely any thing like parental love sustains or informs them, and where, perhaps, confusion, discontent, and domestic turbulence prevail."

The Play ground suggests the consideration of "play grounds

for children of a larger growth." We rejoice that public sympathy and justice are, of themselves, moving in the directions indicated by the following remonstrances:—

"Can any thing be more lamentable to contemplate than a dull, grim, and vicious population, whose only amusement is sensuality? Yet, what can we expect, if we provide no means whatever of recreation; if we never share our own pleasures with our poorer brethren; and if the public buildings which invite them in their brief hours of leisure are chiefly gin palaces? As for our cathedrals and great churches, we mostly have them well locked up, for fear any one should steal in and say a prayer, or contemplate a noble work of art, without paying for it: and we shut people up by thousands in dense towns with no outlets to the country, but those which are guarded on each side by dusty hedges. Now an open space near a town is one of Nature's Churches: and it is an imperative duty to provide such things. Nor, indeed, should we stop at giving breathing places to crowded multitudes in great towns. To provide cheap locomotion, as a means of social improvement, should be ever in the minds of legislators and other influential persons. Blunders in legislating about railroads, and absurd expenditure in making them, are a far greater public detriment than they appear at first sight."

The most important section in the Essay is that on the Workman's Home. There the ignorance or vice of the labourer works the most fearful misery and savage demoralization. It has often struck us as most strange that the class from which all domestic servants are taken should be so ignorant of domestic economy, and that the knowledge acquired in the families of the wealthy and the gentry should not descend among their friends and acquaintances, and gradually be diffused through the working classes. We are told that the best wife for a poor man is always a servant taken from some respectable and well-ordered family, where she has grown accustomed to neatness, cleanliness, and comfort. Of course with a poor, particularly with an uneducated man, the counterpoise to temptation must be found in the attractions of his home. After his day's toil the strong man will not sit down to gaze vacantly on bare walls, dirt and discomfort. For the empty mind especially must amusements and comforts be found of an innocent kind, or evil spirits will flock to it as a place prepared and garnished for their use. We believe that there are no more flagrant evidences of the selfish rapacity that prevails in this country, and of the utter disregard with which Law and Government have consigned the labourer to the monied classes, than are afforded by the whole of the circumstances con-

nected with the building and letting of the tenements of the poor. Life, health, decency, daily disgust and wretchedness, malaria, fever, and death, weigh not with builders and landlords to the extent of the cost of a common drain. They draw their rent from places in which they know that people must inevitably sicken and rot. The land-owner who sells his land careless of its ultimate appropriation if he gets his price, the small capitalist who trades in pest-houses, and the Government or Corporations who permit such scandalous trading within their circles of influence, are all participators in a sordid cruelty, whose enormity it is impossible to describe. To go through the disgusting details would only be to enumerate every thing that is loathsome, filthy, and poisonous, in undrained and unpaved streets, animal and vegetable decomposition, stagnant water, putrid exhalations, and accumulated impurities. Our Author states that "the difference of expense in building a row of small cottages, back to back, which it will be hard to ventilate, and which must be without the most obvious household requisites, and that of building a row of cottages each of which shall have a yard at the back, will be about 22 per cent. upon the outlay." Now it is a well-known fact that the most comfortable tenements are those which are most carefully kept, which always secure the best tenants, and which, on these accounts, are often let at rent lower than much worse houses, but which yet is remunerating because the respectability of the occupier, and regularity of payment, can be relied upon. The following Evidence appears against Liverpool, given before a Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1842:

"Is Liverpool a town which has a considerable quantity of land which may be made available for the purpose of erecting houses?—There is a good deal of land in the suburbs.

"The Corporation possess a good deal of land?—They do.

"Have you had under your consideration the provisions of what is called Lord Normanby's Act, by which it is forbidden to build houses back to back?—Yes.

"What were the reasons which induced the Corporation of Liverpool not to object to houses being so built?—If houses were not to be built back to back there would be a great sacrifice of land."

In every town the local authorities should undertake the paving, draining, cleansing, lighting, and the supply of water,—not permitting private individuals to traffic in these necessaries, nor to appropriate to themselves large profits from such sources, which should go to lighten the general burdens of the community. Our Author is of opinion that one of the safest under-

takings in which a man could engage, supposing him to be satisfied with reasonable profits, and to take some interest in the well-being of his fellow men, "would be to provide fit dwellings for the labouring population around him."

In connection with Towns, one of the first duties of the public Authorities is the abolition of the Smoke-nuisance. It is said that 'the actual quantity of Smoke hanging any day over London is the fourth part of the fuel consumed on that day.' It is pithily remarked that, "if the pecuniary injury done to the inhabitants of great towns by smoke could only be put in the form of a smoke rate, what unwearied agitation there would be against it."

Without suggesting any means by which it may be conducted, the Author attaches much and deserved importance to social intercourse between the employers and the employed.

"By social intercourse I do not merely mean that which will naturally take place in the ordinary charities, such as visiting the sick, managing Clothing Societies, and the like: but that intercourse which includes an interchange of thought, an occasional community of pursuit, and an opportunity of indirect instruction; which may be frequent and extensive enough to avoid the evil effects of a sense of perpetual condescension on one side, and timidity on the other; and which may give the employer some chance at least of learning the general wants and wishes of his people, and also of appreciating their individual characters.

"This matter is not an easy one. It requires tact, patience, discretion, and the application of several of the maxims mentioned in the preceding chapter. I am not sure however that it is any sacrifice whatever in the way of pleasure. The manufacturer's family who occasionally give an evening to social intercourse with their people, will not, perhaps, find that evening less amusing than many that they may pass with their equals."

The claims of Labour have a close relation to the claims of Poverty, and it is often from our neglect of the former, that they present themselves in the latter shape. Mr. Carlyle mentions, with terrible energy, the case of a woman whose necessities could obtain for her no sympathy from her fellow-creatures until she sickened in fever, and by spreading around her disease and death, forced *thus* the recognition of a common humanity. And so we neglect our duties to the labourer, leave himself without means of instruction or recreation, and his children without education, until instead of dealing with honest and industrious Toil, we have to provide for degraded and reckless Pauperism.

The Letter to the Bishop of London by Presbyter Catholicus on 'Visiting Societies and Lay Readers' originated in the formation, under the auspices of the Bishop, of a "Metropolitan Visiting and Relief Association." This, Presbyter considers as a virtual re-enactment, under another form, of the Old Poor Law, renewing all the evils and vices of that System to whatever extent this new *public scheme* may operate. Presbyter states that no sooner did the advertisements appear, announcing a new Association for the Relief of the Destitution of the Metropolis, than every adventurous pauper, within a practicable distance, bent his way to London. "When we consider the loss thus incurred by our own poor, and add to it all the wretchedness which must have been suffered, both on their journey and after their arrival, by those deluded persons, who flocked to London on seeing the advertisements of 'The Metropolitan Relief Association,' we have no doubt, but that for the £20,000 worth of good, which its directors promised to do according to their widely-promulgated Subscription-list, they must have inflicted at least double that amount of misery;—and this, probably, before their plans were sufficiently matured to have enabled them to disburse a farthing for its relief. So impossible is *public* charity! So indispensable is it, that in alms-giving 'the left hand should not know what the right hand doeth.'"

Presbyter's idea is that all *public* Charities for the relief of destitution are evils, creating expectations that can never be answered, advertising a certain amount of money and goods for which the idle, the vicious, the dependent, and all who are drawn into these classes by the force of the temptation, immediately become competitors,—and in fact, '*creating the necessity they relieve, but not relieving all the necessity they create.*' Presbyter's remedy is *private* Charity, and such an increase to the Working Clergy, the almoners of the wealthy, as would secure a weekly visit to every poor man's house from his spiritual friend and adviser. But even this scheme necessarily partakes of the character of a *public* Charity, and would equally excite expectation unfavourable to independence and self-denial,—whilst there is little more security that the Clergy would prove judicious almoners, or healthy spiritual directors, than the average of visitors selected from the intelligent and middle classes. It is easier to expose the evils to which all public Charities are liable, than to suggest an unexceptionable Substitute. We are inclined to think that Provident Societies, established, not for the purpose of relieving destitution, but of aiding in the formation of prudent, economical and saving habits, yet bringing such destitution as may exist under the observation of private beneficence, are,

in the present condition of our labouring population, indispensable in this country. We see no evils, provided it does not make *Relief* an avowed and prominent object, to which such Societies are exposed, which would not equally attend the official charity of a Clerical almoner. The scheme, moreover, implies a more thorough carrying out of the *Parochial* system than is now possible among the motley creeds and professions of the people of England. Presbyter speaks as if the Church was to take upon itself the whole of the administrative charity of the country.

Presbyter is a man of wit and pungency, and puts in very ridiculous pictures, the results of the Rev. Mr. A.'s endeavour to procure district visitors. But this is rather over-shooting the mark, for from the picture that is given of the Rev. Mr. A. himself, it is certain that he is one of the same class, and would make no better visitor than his despised friends. Yet Presbyter's scheme is to entrust all the visiting to the Rev. Mr. As. No doubt the difficulty which Presbyter states so well is real and great. "Talk of the imaginative powers 'of the lover, the lunatic, or the poet!' Why such persons are not half so 'compact of imagination' as the staid members of this new Joint Stock Charity Association! A very few days since, one of its zealous supporters told your Lordship's correspondent, that 'nothing was easier to be met with than men and women calculated to act as district visitors, for the only qualities required were, *sincere religious principles, and sound common sense!*' Nothing more! The two rarest qualities in the world to be found apart; and, of course, still more rare to be met with in union!" But would this difficulty certainly be removed by providing an *educated* Clergyman for every *thousand* persons, which is Presbyter's scheme for "raising the condition of the poor?" Nothing will raise the condition of the poor but education and employment, and the only harmless *Charity* is that which, with no avowed object but to help the poor to help themselves, in its rounds of beneficence to the independent, necessarily becomes acquainted with the destitution that exists, and brings it into communication with private benevolence. If Education and Employment were as they might be, all Charity would become a social and brotherly intercourse between the various classes; but in the existing stagnation of the sources both of moral and physical prosperity, he is a bold man who thinks that a community can do without some Machinery for obtaining certain knowledge of the condition of its people. Presbyter is keen, cutting, and, we admit, just in his destructive criticisms on the operation of public charities, but we wish he had not concluded

with proposing an extension of the *parochial* system, and administering a rebuke to the Bishop of Winchester for injuring that parochial system, by selecting the Incumbent to a vacant benefice from another Diocese. All this is too *professional*.

There are some amusing and some painful anecdotes, all of them instructive, of the evils produced by ignorant and fanatical District Visitors and Lay readers. Here is a lesson for many a condescending lady, who deems that her charitable visit authorizes any amount of curiosity, interference, impertinent fault-finding, and unasked advice.

"When your correspondent, my Lord, once asked an old Scotch woman, 'Why she always locked her door against the visiting lady?' her answer was, 'She's an idle, chattering body; and I'd rather want her coals than be fashed with her questions.' With honest, plain-dealing, industrious, independent spirits, like old Martha's, this sentiment is universal."

The difficulty of relieving, through the agency of a *public* Society, 'without creating more necessity than you relieve,' is admirably exemplified in a supposed case, which every one will admit to be real enough.

"The visitor sets out upon his round, to do his best towards discovering where it [distress] presses most severely, and to apply, as judiciously as he can, the funds entrusted to him for its relief.—He comes to a house inhabited entirely by labouring people; a family in each room. On the first floor, in one apartment, he finds a man, his wife and two children. They have every comfort about them. The husband is a shoemaker; the wife helps at the binding; the eldest child is put to school at twopence a-week, the other is too young to leave the mother. At present, their whole earnings do not exceed 10*s*. a-week; but they had saved some money in the summer, and they expect to be in the receipt of better wages in the spring. In the other apartment lives a man, with his wife and one child. He is also a shoemaker; his room is filthy, offensive in smell, and destitute of any furniture, except his bench, a black tea-kettle, two or three articles of damaged earthenware, and a lump of dirty shavings, which, with some old horse-cloths, are bundled up in a corner of the room by day, and are spread out at night to serve the family as a bed. The circumstances of this man, as to the amount of his weekly earnings, are precisely those of his neighbour in the next room; though in one respect he is better off, as he has only one child to feed, and no schooling to pay for. But he earns only 10*s*. a-week. This must supply him, his wife and child, with lodging, clothing, food and firing. In the spring, summer, and autumn, he had higher wages; but then

he owed a large bill at the shop, and had spent the rest; so that now he is really in a state of poverty, having borrowed, wherever he could find any neighbour to lend; run in debt, wherever he could get credit; and pawned every article of dress or furniture, on which a penny could be raised. Here then are two cases in which the visitor is called upon to take an active part. They may be considered as fair representatives of nearly all the cases which he will meet with in the course of his perambulation. How is the visitor to deal with them? Will he not give to either? Then he may as well fling his journal, and his relief-tickets, and all the apparatus of a district visitor, into the fire; for he will very rarely meet with any necessity greater than that of the family I have last described. The distress, it is true, has been brought on by imprudence and vice; but if he refuse help to all the misery which originates in such causes, he will find very few claimants on his benevolence; and will soon begin to doubt whether it is worth while to keep up the cumbersome machinery of a Visiting Society for the sake of a few cases of such very rare occurrence, or whether a Visiting Society affords the most fitting and Christian method of relieving them. Will he then assist this case? If he does, he will confer on the dissolute and the imprudent that which his prudent and virtuous neighbour in the adjoining room is unable to purchase. The visitor's ticket of bread and coals renders this unworthy fellow's income for the week far better than that of the industrious, independent, high-minded man, who is bravely struggling against his difficulties on the other side of the partition which divides their rooms; and alms so given operate, to all intents and purposes, as a premium on vice, and a great discouragement to virtue. What then is to be done? The visitor will try, perhaps, to make all straight by assisting both families. He will bestow his gifts on one, as a relief to the temporary destitution which, according to the ordinance of Divine Providence, is the appointed punishment of a careless course of life; and, on the other, as a reward for his industry and prudence. But is it wise to initiate this man into the practice of looking for and accepting such foreign help? Is it well to instruct him, that he may spend all his summer earnings, because a benevolent off-shoot of the Grand Metropolitan Visiting and Relief Association has undertaken to provide for his winter wants? Will not such a gift, while it saps the principle of independence, open to him the knowledge of a resource in the hour of need, which must of necessity tend to relax the energies of those moral qualities, to which he is indebted for his comparative comforts?"

Now all this is unanswerable when directed against a Society

which *professes* to make Relief its object, but of no force against a Visiting Association aiming to promote the provident habits of the people, and the Education of their children,—yet whilst pursuing its course of undegrading beneficence, indirectly obtaining such a supervision of a large town, as to have the means of bringing private charity into operation, and of preventing destitution to languish and die unnoticed. Perhaps the best means of securing this good, with as little as may be of attending evil, would be through the appointment of Ministers to the Poor, supported by the Christian zeal and philanthropy of our various religious denominations. If there was any *fraternity*, that is, if there was any Christianity, in our Churches, such a union as would impart a knowledge of their several operations, and prevent any part of 'the field of the world' from lying unoccupied by labourers, might most readily be effected. But such a scheme can be worked beneficially neither by the Church alone, nor by a State provision.

To the plea that by such Associations anything can be done to connect together classes of Society too widely severed by worldly circumstances, Presbyter replies:

"My Lord, excuse the expression, but I cannot help considering this as wretched cant. Why do 'worldly circumstances' sever the different classes of Society? I need not say why.—Every man who considers the question will at once find that the evils which cause this separation of classes are of too fatal a character and extended an influence to be remedied by this forced attempt to bring a few individuals of each into occasional contact. The ties by which man and man are united, are not thus easily forged. The rich and poor, the employed and unemployed, cannot be restored to their right condition of reciprocal kindness by the intermediation of a lady with a *coal* ticket.* * * ——The tie of friendly care on the one hand, and of attached dependence on the other, has been gradually loosened. Instead of it there has grown up between master and servant a cold, unsympathising, incommunicable distance; an obstinate, impenetrable reserve, which exists in no other country, which every really Christian heart feels it painful to keep up, and which no one of ordinary good nature could think of maintaining towards a dog or cat, that he happened to come so frequently in contact with. By such a state of things both parties are losers; the master and the mistress perhaps the most. It may be taken as a rule without exception, that the members of a family cannot live long in a state of indifference towards each other. If they are not united by feelings of regard, they will be severed by feelings of enmity. If the master takes no care to attach his domestics by

words and acts of kindness, they very soon begin to look upon him with an evil eye; to lose all concern for his interests; and, if they abstain from defrauding him themselves, to rejoice in the success of the cheat by which he is defrauded. It is only latterly that all the links of good feeling between the higher and lower members of the same household have been broken asunder. They used to be bound together by a joint interest in the younger branches of the family. * ——The school, in which the terms of intercourse that ought properly to subsist between all Christian people were acquired, has been broken up. Protecting and cordial familiarity in the great, dependent and affectionate familiarity in the lowly, are things that no longer exist. In less ostentatious and luxurious times, every man's kindly feelings flowed in their natural course, to his relatives, his neighbours, his tenants, his domestics, his dependents. Now, as communication between distant places has been rendered more easy, they are made to extend over an immense circle of acquaintances. The affections used to descend, like the showers of heaven, comforting and gladdening and fertilizing the plains beneath; they now float lightly over the surface of the level on which they spring, starving everything below, and doing little more than sustain the languid interest of a continually increasing society. What is wanted is the restoration of an humbler, kindlier, freer manner of intercourse between manufacturers and their men, farmers and their labourers, masters of families and their domestic servants; and I cannot understand how any approximation to the attainment of this most desirable state of things is to be made by the occasional call of a strange lady or gentleman on a poor family, with which she or he has no connection whatever."

Several examples are given of the mischief inflicted on the poor by the ignorance and fanaticism of lay readers. We fear that tales equally sad and shocking might be told of the *educated* Clergy,—indeed it is evident that Presbyter's reliance is upon the Clergy who are *not* evangelical. In the following case the preacher was a lady. The narrative is extracted from the journal of a London Curate.

"There is no creature in the world so hard-hearted as the woman who makes charity her business. This morning's scene has annoyed and grieved me very much. I called on poor Mrs. Smart. She cannot have more than a day or two to live. The poor creature was, as usual, on the three chairs placed together, which form her only bed; but sitting up, and in a state of frightful nervous agitation. Her hands were clasped, and pressed tight against her breast. She was rocking herself back-

wards and forwards, as violently as her weakness would allow; and repeating, with a continually increased rapidity of utterance, till the words became confounded and were scarcely distinguishable—'Oh! Lord! take away my heart of stone and give me a heart of flesh! Oh! Lord! take away my heart of stone and give me a heart of flesh!' Beside her stood a tall, stout, bolt upright woman, securely defended against the winter's cold by an impenetrable mass of shawls and furs, with a face rubicund and shining, and looking as if providence had placed an ample supply of the treasures of this life at her disposal, which she availed herself of in three ample meals a-day, with a pot of porter at each. On my entering the room, the Visitor noticed me with that air of formal and supercilious distance which highly evangelical ladies are apt to exhibit towards those of the clergy whom they condemn as not sufficiently spiritual in their views. Pointing to the poor dying creature, she said, 'A sad sight, sir! a miserable end! No hope, I fear, here!' 'Why, what has happened? There was none of this excitement when I left her this morning.' 'The heart of stone! The heart of stone! No answer to her prayers! No fruit of the spirit! No joy!' 'Oh madam! why do you pass so severe a sentence on our poor sister?' 'Can you consider this anything but a state of reprobation? Where is the heart of flesh? Where is the joy?' 'Joy! madam!' 'What! do you mean to assert, sir, that *joy* is not an indispensable fruit of the spirit!' 'This is really no place or time for religious controversy. When you have finished your visit, I will return to Mrs. Smart.' 'I have done, sir! I am going; pray don't let me drive you away.' And doubling her boa over her double chin, without deigning to look at the poor creature whom she had condemned to everlasting perdition, she stalked out of the room. As soon as the visiting lady left us, I sat down on a box beside poor, ignorant, inoffensive Mrs. Smart, and did my best to tranquillize her. I first induced her to stop the quick, anxious, hysterical repetition of the words which had been put into her mouth. When I had succeeded in this, and she became composed, I explained the nature both of 'a heart of stone' and 'a heart of flesh.' I showed her that the one signified a state of mind which was insensible to all religious impressions; the other a state of mind which was open to such impressions. I, by my questions, led her back through a calm course of self-examination on these important subjects, to the hopeful reliance on God's mercy, through Christ, which she had enjoyed in my previous visits; and then, after reading some prayers from the visitation service, I took my leave of her for to-day."

Presbyter Catholicus makes some suggestions respecting a provision for the increased number of clergy required by his extended parochial scheme; among others a repeal of the Mortmain Act. All this savours too much of the Ecclesiastical spirit, with which, notwithstanding its good sense and poignant style, this Letter is strongly tinctured.

ART. VII.—ESSAYS ON THE PURSUIT OF TRUTH AND ON THE PROGRESS OF KNOWLEDGE.—By SAMUEL BAILEY, Author of Essays on the Formation and Publication of Opinions, &c. Second Edition. Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans. London.

MR. BAILEY is an old and well-known labourer in the cause of truth; and we rejoice to find a work devoted to such high and abstract themes as the Essays on the pursuit of Truth, so far appreciated as to reach a second edition, even slowly. The subject is most thoroughly and successfully handled, and we think that no one could rise from its study without feeling his ardour in the pursuit of truth roused, and his determination strengthened to let nothing prevent his struggle for its attainment. To the liberal theologian, especially, this volume recommends itself, as he will find in it the right and the duty of free inquiry, ably set forth and illustrated.

In the Essay on the Pursuit of Truth, the author proceeds on the ground that "Truth, by which term is implied accuracy of knowledge and inference, is necessarily conducive to the happiness of the human race;" and on the other hand that, according to the maxim of Malebranche, "Error is the universal cause of the misery of mankind." From these premises he advances, irresistibly, to the conclusion, established in the second chapter, that it is the duty of all to enter upon the pursuit of truth as they have power and opportunity. The remaining chapters of this Essay are occupied in an investigation of the important duties in the process of inquiry, of whether men are morally responsible for the Issue of Inquiry, and of the Duties of Individuals and Governments in relation to the pursuit of Truth. The chapters form, as a whole, a beautiful specimen of complete and logical reasoning. The very perfection of Mr. Bailey's argument makes us everywhere wish that he had advocated the cause of Truth on higher grounds than that of its being merely conducive to happiness; for we believe that the investigation of it is the most solemn worship we can pay to the All True; that Truth itself is an aliment necessary to our spiritual nature, and that we are bound to its pursuit by all the laws of our Moral Being; nay, more, that it is not a matter of volition with us, for that all men instinctively, according to their abilities, do and must seek after some truth. It is rare, indeed, that we see a mind such as that of Milton, which cannot refrain from the most profound investigations; and yet the impetuous and over-

ruling passion for Truth, which we perceive in him, is but a type of the necessity which forces every man, whether engaged in business or in pleasure, to seek some of the laws of the constitution of himself, and of the world, by which to direct his life. We do not mean, however, to deny the validity of the greatest happiness—principle, as a test of the utility of many important things, but merely to record our protest against its being considered the highest principle by which we should judge human affairs. Indeed, tried by this principle, many of the most heroic actions, which have been performed for truth, would seem foolhardy and presumptuous; for, if we pursue truth for the sake of happiness, it can never become our duty to sacrifice happiness for truth, and, hence, we must blame the self-devotion of every martyr to scientific or religious truth, and the example of Christ himself becomes of none effect.

But, granting Mr. Bailey's proposition, nothing can be more admirable than the force of argument by which he has urged the pursuit of truth. We quote as an example from p. 21. "The pernicious consequences of erroneous and degrading conceptions of the Deity on the moral conduct of mankind, have seldom been sufficiently considered. To every man, the ideas which he forms of God must constitute a model to which he will naturally tend to conform himself, and according to which he will consider himself obliged in many cases to shape his own actions. If, therefore, he represents in his own imagination this Almighty Being as of an arbitrary, malevolent, selfish, and revengeful character (which are too often the actual notions lurking in the minds of the unenlightened, while the attributes of good and just and merciful are on their lips), he will insensibly, and without any compunction, become cruel, capricious, and tyrannical in his own sphere; or, perhaps, in many cases, it would be more correct to say he would remain so. For barbarous and ignorant man first forms his notions of the Deity from his own low standard of what an All-powerful Being would do (beyond which, in fact, it is impossible for him to go); and then having consecrated his crude ideas by fixing upon them the imaginary stamp of divinity, he fears to depart from them, and it is with difficulty that he advances to more accurate and enlightened views of moral excellence than are warranted by the model of his own creation."

Perhaps the most admirable and convincing parts of this essay occur in the refutation of the arguments usually advanced to stifle the duty of inquiry. We quote the passage in which the author refutes the notion that there are inquiries which are unlawful, that there are secrets in the universe man must not

pry into. He says, p. 48, "A more striking instance of a completely false analogy could not be adduced. There is not a single point of resemblance throughout the whole field of knowledge to these little secrets, the offspring of human weakness, or the indispensable resources of human imperfection. There is no secret in the natural or moral world, sacred from the investigation of man. Here, there can be no presumption, no undue boldness, no counterpart at all to the audaciousness of one person intruding upon the privacy of another. All that man has to guard against, and that simply for his own sake, is error; his vigilance is required only to insure that his facts are properly ascertained, and his inferences correctly deduced. The presumption he has to repress is not any presumption in relation to other beings in possession of secrets, which he is trying clandestinely to wrest from them, but merely the presumption of drawing positive and ample conclusions from doubtful and slender premises, of supposing he has discovered what he has not, that he has succeeded where he has only failed, that he has done what still remains to be accomplished; in a word, the presumption of overrating his own achievements. Here, indeed, a man may err in self-confidence, but an evil cannot obviously arise from searching too far, which is best remedied by searching further, by closer reasoning and more rigorous investigation."

Chapter III. contains a very valuable essay on the Duties of the Inquirer in relation to the state of his own mind. In this the author analyzes our states of mind with philosophical accuracy in relation to the investigation of truth, and shows clearly that it is our duty to banish from ourselves, as far as we are able, the controlling powers of prejudice, passion, and self-interest. But though Mr. Bailey lays down the chart accurately on the side of the Charybdis of the weaknesses of human nature, and warns us lest we should be drawn in by the whirl of the temptations of life, he does not guard us so strongly from the rock of presumption, on which so many self-opinionated persons make shipwreck. Nor, perhaps, does he sufficiently insist on the reverent feeling with which we should undertake the inquiry; for, to search into truth of whatever nature, is to inquire into the laws of Providence, or the nature of the Deity. And the pursuit is not easy, absolute truth is difficult to distinguish, and the mind of the Inquirer is dazzled by so many phantom shapes that appear to claim his homage, that, unless he proceeds with solemn reverence and self-distrust, he is not fit to set forth on the sublime quest.

The reputation which this essay acquired in its first edition

makes it superfluous for us to analyze it more minutely; but, as a further specimen of the author's reasoning powers, we extract the following passage, showing the ill effects for truth of persecution for opinions.

"Forcible suppression (of opinions) not only takes away the opportunity and means of inquiry from the community at large, but destroys or vitiates the natural motives to inquire. There can be no doubt that as rewards encourage a partial attention to evidence in favour of those doctrines for the profession of which they are bestowed, so the opposite treatment, persecution, has, to a large extent, the effect of inducing mankind to shun the persecuted doctrines and the arguments in their support. The lovers of sympathy, who shrink from disapprobation—the worldly, who are alive to profit and pleasure, but indifferent to truth—the indolent and supine, who do not greatly concern themselves about any opinions so long as their ordinary course of life is suffered to run smoothly, are all deterred by a fear of consequences from attending to doctrines which can bring nothing but discredit and danger on their votaries. They are frightened from what is really their imperative duty. With bolder dispositions it is otherwise: when persecution is let loose upon society without being pushed to absolute extermination, the effect upon the strong-minded and energetic is to rouse the spirit of resistance; and this is especially the effect on every one who suffers in his own person. His passions are stimulated against his oppressors, his mind is thrown into an attitude of defiance and contention; and, instead of simply seeking what is true, his whole soul is bent on detecting the errors of his antagonists, and providing himself with every possible argument on his own side. He grasps not at truth, but at the means, whatever they may be, of self-defence, and at the power of annoyance. Provoked to a keen scrutiny, he enters upon it without any adequate sense of the obligation under which he lies, and in a state of mind far from being favourable to stern impartiality of investigation."—p. 183.

The essay on the Progress of Knowledge will be thought by many inferior to that on the Pursuit of Truth; but this impression will arise more, perhaps, from the form of dialogue in which it is written than from any intrinsic inferiority. The form of dialogue is, perhaps, too discursive to admit of the same concentration of thought which we admire in the usual form of essay. The author himself appears to have had some misgivings as to its success, since, in the Preface, he calls the dialogue an experiment. But whatever be thought of the form

of the essay, every one must be pleased with the manner in which the rival view of society are exhibited.

The two first parts of the essay consist of a dialogue beween two individuals, A. and N., the first of whom maintains that the progress of society in knowledge is rapid and cheering, while the other takes a more gloomy and desponding view of the world. The third part is a conversation between the same persons and a moderator, B., who takes an intermediate position between them. We quote the brighter view of human progress, as exhibited by A., page 249:—"A great part of the slowness with which discoveries have succeeded each other may be ascribed to the tardy and limited diffusion of knowledge. N. himself has made the remark, that one discovery must spring from another; that a man of inventive genius must rise from the height to which the labours of his predecessor had carried him. Now, for a series of discoveries and improvements of this kind, I see no necessity for the intervention of long periods of time. If a man of original talent has the power of rising from the discoveries of his predecessor, he may do it, or begin to do it, from the moment they are known to him; and thus one man taking up the achievements of another, there may be a series of them even among contemporary inquirers. The only requisite condition seems to be a ready and immediate promulgation of all that is accomplished. Formerly, indeed, what one man discovered made its way slowly and laboriously to others engaged in the same pursuit. Perhaps he would pass from the scene before his labours were understood and appreciated, and in such a state of imperfect intercommunication a barren interval must undoubtedly elapse between almost every successive discovery in the same science. This lapse of time, however, was required solely to propagate the intelligence among those who were likely to make use of it. At present, when the diffusion may be effected with the instantaneousness of lightning, when the world has become an immense whispering gallery, and the faintest accent of science is heard throughout every civilized country as soon as uttered, the requisite conditions are changed. Long intervals are no longer necessary, and the career of improvement may be indefinitely accelerated. Besides, not only are discoveries more rapidly communicated to discovering minds, and the intervals of the series reduced almost to nothing, but with the general diffusion of knowledge, more of these original intellects start forth, and thus another cause is brought into operation to swell the train and hasten the triumph of science." A. L.

Art. VIII.—THE MUTUAL DEPENDENCE OF MEN IN A SOCIAL STATE.

The saying, 'one man soweth and another reapeth,' has been applicable to the condition of mankind in all ages, and will doubtless continue to be so to the end of time. It is too true in a sense which we cannot but lament, and, if it were possible, would gladly put an end to,—when we see a large part of every community toiling on from day to day, and from year to year, without any adequate compensation; while the fruits of their industry are enjoyed by others, who seem as if they were born not to minister, but to be ministered unto, and to live in the possession of luxuries provided for them by the ill-requited labour of those around them.

But this principle, which appears so little agreeable in some of its aspects, is nevertheless intimately connected with the social nature of man, and with the attributes which more especially constitute his superiority to the brutes. It expresses universally his condition and circumstances as a member of society;—and the more so, in proportion as the relations he sustains to other members of it become more various and extensive, and as the constitution of the society itself partakes of the general improvement of the human mind. It is true in every condition of life (and a most wise and excellent provision it is, contributing to our essential welfare both here and hereafter), that it is scarcely possible for any man to live altogether to himself,—to labour for his own benefit alone,—to sow in such a manner that no other human being shall reap the harvest. It is true, not merely of *beneficial* labours, but also of the mischievous and abusive employment of our talents. So variously are we connected in this world,—in the relations of domestic life,—as neighbours, friends, companions, and in many other ways, by which our fellow-creatures are more or less interested in the consequences of our conduct, that no one can confine those consequences entirely to his own home, still less to his own person. If they are good, others must share them with him,—if bad, the evil effects of his vice or folly of necessity extend to those around him:—"we must suffer or rejoice together, for we are every one members one of another."

Nor is this influence limited to our contemporaries:—for there is perhaps no feature of human nature more remarkable and characteristic,—none which more strikingly indicates the superiority of man over the other orders of creation, than the

opportunity afforded to successive generations to enter into the labours of those who are gone before them. Other animals seem in some few instances,—but to a very limited extent,—to profit by *their own* experience. As they advance to maturity, they seem even to learn by practice a greater degree of skill in the various *arts* (if we may so call them) by which they ensnare their prey, or construct their habitations. But, as far as we can perceive, this acquired skill is confined to the individual; succeeding generations derive no benefit from the experience, or the improvements, of those who have preceded them: each race starts from the same point, and the same, or nearly the same, outward circumstances bring them, in their turn, to the same degree of improvement, such as it is;—but there is no improvement of the species. We have no reason to suppose that the bees of the present time construct their cells, or the birds their nests, in a better, or, in any material respect, a different way, from their progenitors in the first age of the world.

But the condition of man is altogether different. Not only is he able from his own personal experience to derive practical wisdom to an extent vastly greater than is attainable by any other creature, but in addition to this, he profits also by the experience of preceding generations. By the invaluable arts of speech and writing, the acquired knowledge of any individual does not perish with him, or remain during his lifetime his sole exclusive property. It is as a lamp set, not under a bushel, but on a candlestick, and gives light and guidance to all around. The intelligence that burns within, and the power of observation and reflection with which, in greater or less degrees, every human being is gifted, are sources of information of inestimable value, and without these, it is true that other means of knowledge would be but of little service. But no one is confined altogether to his own unaided stores, or left to explore for himself the hidden path of wisdom. We derive instruction, not only from the direct lessons of parents and of teachers, but from the habits and manners and institutions of the community into which we have been born, affording us the various accommodations of civilized life, and the opportunities of acquiring, with increased facility, various kinds of knowledge and improvement, and the means of qualifying ourselves for social usefulness.

Independently of all direct instruction, it is obvious that the mere circumstance of having been born in a land occupied by a Christian and civilized people, is an advantage of unspeakable value, which we possess over the members of a savage tribe; and the successive discoveries, improvements and useful arts, which our fathers from age to age have introduced, as society has

gradually advanced from small and rude beginnings into its present state, form an accumulated treasure, far more important and beneficial to us than any other inheritance we have derived from them. The improvements of former times are not lost with the individuals who originated them, but are more firmly established and completely ascertained by fresh inquiries and repeated experience. They furnish as it were a new point of departure, from which the successors of former improvers can set forth in quest of additional and still more valuable acquisitions, insomuch that there is perhaps no point hitherto attained by the industry or perseverance or genius of man, of which we are entitled to say with confidence that the efforts of future ages will not cast it completely into the shade. The various arts and inventions by which one ingenious man after another has added to the comforts of life, and enabled us to make the most of the means which nature or Providence have placed within our reach, are a continually renewed and inexhaustible source of wealth and of happiness, (so far as happiness depends on outward circumstances,) for every age and every race of men, as long as the world shall endure. These men have laboured, and we and all mankind have entered into their labours. They have sown, but not they only have reaped. We ourselves, and every succeeding race, who have hence derived comforts and enjoyments, information and improvement, not to be obtained before, are still gathering in the rich and copious harvest.

In such cases, however, though it is obvious that we derive the most important benefit from the labours of others, yet it is only in a secondary and modified sense that we can be said to owe them any *obligation* for it, because they had no view to our benefit in the labours by which, as it turns out, they most effectually promoted it. The inventors of paper, of printing, of the steam-engine, though they have become eventually extensive benefactors to mankind, were influenced probably by no such motive, but merely by a regard to their own personal advantage and emolument. They worked for themselves, and perhaps for those immediately around and connected with them, who were naturally dependent on them, or in whose welfare they took a peculiar interest, but they had no view to, as they had in fact no adequate conception of, the prodigious and almost unbounded service they were at the same time rendering to mankind at large, and to all succeeding generations.

For the benefits we derive, and shall always continue to derive, from such arts and inventions as these, there can be no question that an abundant gratitude is due; not however to these our fellow-creatures, but to that all-wise Disposer who has

put a spirit in man, and who has so wonderfully connected us together in the various relations of social life, that we cannot in ordinary circumstances seek the promotion of our own interest, (I mean by honest and lawful means) without at the same time contributing to the general welfare of mankind. Nay even where men intended not good but *evil*, or at least sought only for their own selfish ends, regardless of the mischief they might at the same time be preparing for others, yet a wise Providence has overruled it for good. They meant not so, neither did their heart think so, nevertheless they have been made the instruments of a higher wisdom, working blindly but surely for the promotion of better purposes than they intended. They sowed to the flesh, and will of the flesh reap corruption; but out of this same corruption God has brought forth a produce of great and lasting good to his creatures. If we are thus enabled frequently to perceive that the folly, the wickedness, or the weakness of man is made to work out the righteousness of God, still more clearly and satisfactorily do we trace the course of his Providence, which hath in such wise ordered the present constitution of human affairs, that the useful labours of our predecessors rarely die with them, but serve as the foundation of still more important and desirable improvements, and prepare a store of the most truly valuable wealth for the use of a remote posterity. And here we see displayed for the most part, not the wisdom of man, but the wisdom of God.

In other cases, however, and those in a moral point of view of much greater interest and importance, we enter into the labours of those who have worked, not immediately for their own personal advantage, but with a *direct view* to our benefit, or to the general welfare of mankind. Guided by enlarged and enlightened views, and actuated by a pure and comprehensive benevolence, they have exerted themselves expressly and immediately for the good of others, through the love which they bore them, or the ties of natural relationship and affection. In such cases, a *double* gratitude is due;—first, to these our human benefactors, and afterwards to Him who has so constituted the relations of human life, and adapted them to the natural dispositions of our breasts, that in most instances they foster, encourage, and strengthen the most desirable affections, which have a tendency to withdraw our thoughts from merely selfish objects and pursuits,—to refine and purify our spirits, and at length, by the moral discipline of this world, to prepare our souls for a heavenly state.

These benefits, which mankind may render to each other, when acting under the influence of an enlightened and Christian

benevolence, animated by an earnest desire to consider, not his own merely, but every man another's welfare, are also much more extensive in the field of their operations, in the number, variety, and importance of their objects. The cases in which self-interest is the leading motive which impels men to engage in labours which are, however, conducive to the general welfare, are for the most part merely such as minister, in the first instance at least, to our external wants,—tending to promote the easy, cheap, and abundant supply of the various articles of consumption, which are necessary for our subsistence, or are provided in great variety, in a civilized and prosperous country, to contribute to our accommodation and comfort. And no one can doubt that these things, altogether independent of any moral benefit, are of very great practical value. They contribute, in a very essential degree, to our present ease and happiness; and, where the disposition exists to avail ourselves of the opportunities thus supplied, they facilitate to a very great extent our efforts to fulfil the main and ultimate purpose of our being.

These advantages are certainly distributed among the different members of society, as it is now constituted, in very various and unequal shares;—but no one can have paid to the subject the attention it requires and deserves, who fails to perceive that the humblest and least favoured inhabitant of a civilized and cultivated, and by consequence a comparatively prosperous and opulent country, derive the most valuable advantages from the land they live in, provided only that they are not wanting to themselves. As for the idle, the thoughtless, the improvident, or the intemperate,—they must always be ill-off, let the condition of society, or their external circumstances in other respects, be what they may;—and we do not see why we ought to wish that it should ever be otherwise. But with respect to the outward comforts and supplies adapted to our physical wants, the well-known remark of Dr. Adam Smith is perfectly well-founded, and is even more clearly true at the present time than it was when he made it, "that the accommodation of a European prince does not so much exceed" (in its real value,—that is, in its fitness to contribute to his substantial comfort and enjoyment) "that of an industrious and frugal peasant,—as this latter exceeds that of many an African king, the absolute master of the lives and liberties of ten thousand naked savages."

But these advantages, remarkable and striking as they are, constitute but a small portion of the privileges we enjoy as members of a community in which the institutions of civilized life have been cultivated and improved. Knowledge is here extensively diffused,—not merely that which relates to our present

condition, and enables us to avail ourselves to the utmost of the various material resources it affords,—but that which tends to our moral improvement, and promotes the growth of the dispositions and affections which render earth the most like to heaven, and the fittest preparation for it. When we look back upon the past history of mankind,—when we survey the steps of that gradual progress by which we have been enabled to advance to our present state,—and consider how much of this progress we owe to the zealous labours of many distinguished men, who have actively exerted themselves to bring about the reform of corruptions and abuses in the civil or religious condition of their brethren,—to promote the cause of education or the diffusion of useful knowledge,—and who have persevered in these, and similar excellent and honourable undertakings, through evil report and good report, with the sacrifice of much that ordinary men chiefly value, to their own personal loss and even danger,—all that we at present enjoy seems but the harvest of their toils. In addition to the share of this rich harvest which we personally enjoy, it is surely reasonable to expect that we should receive a moral benefit of yet greater value, in the impressions which such things are calculated to produce on our own hearts, by exciting our warm affections towards our friends, by stimulating our solicitude in like manner to minister to their welfare, and to promote their most important interests to the best of our ability, gradually enlarging, from time to time, the sphere of our affections, as our views of the world and of human life become more comprehensive, and our means of serving our brethren are proportionally extended:—thus leading us, by degrees, practically to perceive and acknowledge that no man liveth to himself.

Will it be said, that these are reflections fit for such only as occupy high and distinguished stations?—who are enabled to work on a more extensive scale and a more public stage, so as to promote the welfare of large classes and of successive generations, and thus to create for themselves a name which is likely to be held in lasting remembrance?—No doubt such eminent benefactors to their species as have a more elevated station allotted to them, and are endowed with such talents as enable them to fulfil the important duties of these stations with credit and usefulness, have a great and serious responsibility imposed on them; and it seems but reasonable that they should reap a proportionate reward in the honour and distinguished fame which their labours procure for them. Though indeed such men, in proportion as they are really competent to the eminent posts they occupy, will generally be found superior to the influence of these meaner motives; and seeking for their

appropriate recompense,—not in the praise of *men*, even of wise and good men, but in the consciousness of doing right,—of labouring, through the Divine blessing, not without success, in the service of their brethren,—and, chiefly, in the approbation and acceptance of Him whose creatures and servants they are, and who appointed them their respective stations in this world.

But we should be in the wrong, to suppose that such men as these alone are expected to labour, in order that others may enter into their labours. In fact, it becomes us to consider, that as all our powers, whatever may be their extent, however wide or prominent the field of their exercise, are alike the gift of the One Supreme, so the differences which here exist, and which strike us so forcibly, between the respective conditions and opportunities of different individuals, are as nothing in the eyes of Him who regards all things in their just and true proportions, and who sees the end from the beginning. Remembering that this is the earliest stage of our existence, deriving its main importance, whatever condition we may occupy here, from its tendency to prepare us for that which is to succeed, it ought to be considered that the powers which are here exercised, and the affections which are here cultivated, and the just and enlarged views which may here be formed of the plans of the Divine government, and the mutual relations we bear as the creatures and children of God, whose present duty it is to assist and serve each other, are all destined to come into exercise, and to receive a still more full and complete development than any of which they are capable here, in another and a better state.

This reflection, combined with the consideration, that all our talents and opportunities, be they great or small in the estimation of human judges, derive their main importance and value from the circumstance of their being the gift of Him by whom kings reign and princes decree justice, will prompt even those who are externally the most humble and obscure, to *reverence* themselves. Not that they will be puffed up with an extravagant notion of their personal importance; but that they will regard whatever they have received as possessing a peculiar dignity and excellence, derived from the hand which bestowed it. Freely we have received, through the wise disposals of a gracious Providence, the fruits of the toil and ingenuity and perseverance, and not only so but, of the generous and active benevolence, of those who have gone before us,—freely let us give,—freely spend and be spent,—and as we have been reapers from the past, be also sowers for the future, that those who come after us may enter into our labours, and continue, in their turn, the harvests and seed times of Providence. W. T.

Art. IX.—JOSEPH BARKER'S TRACTS. Chapman, London.

Two years and a half ago we introduced to the notice of our readers, and we believe to the first acquaintance of many of them, the remarkable man whose name stands at the head of this article, and whose incipient career as an independent but earnest fellow-labourer with the liberal theologians of this country, we even then contemplated with the liveliest interest.* Since that time Mr. Barker has not been idle, as is shown by the bundle of forty tracts and upwards which lie before us as we write, all of them printed, and the greater part composed, by himself, and forming, after all, but a selection from the still larger variety of his addresses to the public. We watch Mr. Barker's career with interest—we watched it for a time with anxiety. So free and fearless a mind as his was not likely to keep itself within any bounds but those which truth appeared to him to dictate; and as he had already undergone such a total revolution of sentiment on so many subjects, making up his mind with such apparent rapidity and decision on each as it presented itself to him, we trembled lest the impetuosity of his course should leave sound judgment fatally in the rear. It would be implying more agreement with Mr. Barker than we feel, if we were to say that the danger appears to us to have been escaped, and that our anxiety has entirely ceased. We know the history of free and independent minds too well to count with confidence on the permanence of any existing agreement. A man who has thrown off shackle after shackle, who has resisted the most overwhelming of spiritual despotisms, who has cleared at a bound the gulf which separates the world from the few, and joined the latter, is not likely to be much affected by any state of opinion among those to whom he has united himself. If he has braved the frowns of a conference he will not be touched in the slightest degree by any thing of what Bentham would call "body-spirit," or *esprit de corps*. If he has thrown off orthodoxy, he will not *put on* heresy. If councils and canons never made him pause, he will not reflect twice on the results of a century's free and yet careful inquiry among liberal theologians. He will not, on finding a difference subsisting between himself and them, be led on that account to doubt the accuracy of his

* See *Christian Teacher*, N. S., No. XVI., April 1842, Art. V., on the Origin of the New Sect in this Country, called "Christians."

judgment or the correctness of his induction. He is the centre of his own system. No spiritual neighbour's doubts or differences will induce him to pause. He joined his new friends because they agreed with *him*, not because he agreed with *them*. Thus is he a free man still, of a new and, perhaps, an unfinished growth. Unitarians, calculating on the permanence of a perhaps temporary agreement, are thus sometimes disappointed. Your comet's course runs parallel with your's at this moment; but how long that parallelism may continue, neither you, perhaps, nor the comet knows. As it dashed suddenly into your course, it may dash as suddenly out of it. Unitarians, in welcoming a new labourer among them, invite to no second slavery. It was by the exercise of his freedom that the new labourer came amongst them, and it is only in the exercise of it that he will remain. He has not the respectful restraints, the long poisings and fluctuations of opinion, the returns of the pendulum of faith to the old point, the waitings for increased light and evidence, and for the remote and slow decision which, shadowed forth in the history of his own mind, or in that of his associates, mark the solid resulting views of your thorough-bred English Presbyterian. With the convert, matters are very different; all is double-quick time with him. If he had been as cautious as you, he never would have been out of the enemy's camp at all: and accordingly, after welcoming him with joy into your little army, and making the very most of him, you are amazed to find him, some fine morning, beating an advance or a retreat, as the case may be, while you yourself only meditate remaining quietly in quarters. The Unitarians are beginning to learn what most denominations have learned already, that the convert, as he is called, especially if he be a man of mark, will be the last person in the world to march to a denominational trumpet, and in his onslaught on the errors and superstitions of the world around him, ten chances to one if he confine himself to the line of battle. Like the volunteers in the American army, when he shoots, he shoots on his own account.

We are far from wishing our readers to apply these remarks in their full force to Mr. Barker: but a calm estimate of the rights of a free mind and of customary denominational expectations, is always useful in judging of the nature and value of such an acquisition as he is to the ranks of Christian truth. At present Mr. Barker's views on the theological doctrines of the Scriptures seem exactly to accord with those usually held by Unitarians, and though we were at one time disposed to await some ulterior modifications of opinion, and were far from sure what would be the final position of Christianity as a system of

Divine Truth in his appreciation, we now think that his moral estimate of its worth and excellence, as of its supreme importance, is so high, so rooted and sincere, that the new and freer principles of criticism which are evidently by degrees unfolding themselves to his view will leave that estimate untouched, and will quietly lodge themselves in his mind, without that convulsion to the higher and permanent faith which so often unfortunately accompanies their too rapid and summary admission. We look, then, on Mr. Barker's theological position as more fixed than we regarded it a short time since. We believe that his faith in the spiritual power and truth of Christianity will stand the shock of the freer canons which he is beginning to discover must be applied to the reception and interpretation of the letter. We are only doubtful whether Mr. Barker's ardent mind will allow him at all times to place his new impressions in their own relative position, and assign to them only their due and just importance. We fear his frank and manly disposition may sometimes lead him to battle for what, in his view, is sound and true, with an energy more proportioned to the opposition which it will meet with than to its own absolute importance, and thus that the capital truths of a pure theology, the advocacy of which is met and understood by the plain sense and Scriptural knowledge of the people, will be merged under questions of less practical importance, and for the right decision of which more subtlety of argument and a greater extent of reading and reflection are required.

As Mr. Barker's Tracts bear neither numbers nor dates we have no clue whereby to arrange them in a progressive series, which would, if we could effect it, greatly aid us in forming a judgment of the direction and progress of his inquiries. But as illustrative of the remarks which we have just made, we will take two Tracts, one on the Inspiration of the Scriptures, and the other on Inspiration, Infallibility, &c., and we judge from internal evidence that the first-named was first published. In this Tract he says—

"I have not the slightest doubt of the inspiration of any of those 'Holy Scriptures' of which the Apostle Paul speaks in 2 Tim. iii. 15—17. I believe that those Scriptures included the Books of Moses, the Psalms, the Prophets, and some other books as well. I believe the Song of Solomon was not included in the Scriptures referred to by Paul. The following are some of my reasons for thus believing: 1. The Scriptures which the Apostle calls the *Holy* Scriptures, were 'able to make men wise unto salvation through faith in Christ Jesus, and were,—*all* of them,—profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.' This is not the case with Solomon's Song.

I cannot find in it the slightest allusion either to Christ or to God, either to any point of scriptural doctrine, or to any branch of religious duty. It does not even inculcate the duties of husbands and wives. There is not the most distant allusion to duty of any kind throughout the whole book. For any thing that appears in the Book to the contrary, the Author might have been a disbeliever altogether in religion, a complete Epicurean unbeliever. A book more thoroughly free from all allusion to God or Providence, to duty or responsibility, to rewards or punishments,—a book more completely and thoroughly earthly and carnal, I never recollect to have seen."

After assigning other reasons from Dr. Clarke, and from the inferred testimony of Josephus, against the canonical authority of this book, he proceeds to discuss the claims of the Book of Revelations to form part of the canon, and rejects it.

But taking up the second Tract, the one on Inspiration, Infallibility, &c., which we suppose to have been written at a subsequent period, we find that Mr. Barker's views have started onwards a little. Here are some extracts from it; the first is the opening passage:—

"Who can prove that inspiration was confined to the days of the Apostles? Who can prove that inspiration is not granted to men in the present day? Who can prove that inspiration was not intended for all God's people, throughout all ages? For any thing that I can see to the contrary, all Christians are inspired. The common notion appears to be that inspiration was only granted to the Apostles and a few others: and that after the Apostolic age, it was gradually withdrawn, to be restored no more. I see no reason for this notion.

"*It is my belief that all the disciples of Christ are inspired, as truly inspired as the first Apostles were.*

"But I would reply farther, that the consequences of admitting the truth in this case, will *not* be such as are represented. A man may call in question the infallibility of the Apostles, without rendering their writings or sermons of no use to him. He may believe that the Apostles were in error, in ignorance, or in doubt, on some points, and yet have the fullest certainty that they were right in others. A man may believe that the Apostles were slow to learn, and never infallible; and yet profit by their writings. I am myself persuaded—I am convinced beyond doubt,—that the Apostles were not infallible; and yet I both profit by their writings, and have full confidence, and an absolute assurance of the truth and divinity of *many things* which they have left us in their writings. I have as full a confidence, and as perfect an assurance, of the truth of *a great part* of what they have written, as well as of the truth and excellency of what they delivered in their sermons, as those who believe that the Apostles were absolutely infallible from the day of Pentecost to the day of their death.

"I wish you to observe, that I am not writing this to show that certainty in reference to religious matters is not attainable: I believe a

man may be as certain with respect to the great principles of religion, as he is with respect to his own existence. I do not hesitate to state, that I have such certainty myself. My conviction of the truth of the great principles of Christianity, and my assurance that the great principles of Christianity are with sufficient correctness set forth in the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists, is as free from doubt as my belief in my own existence. And I believe that such fulness of conviction or assurance is attainable by God's people generally. What I wish to show is this, that our certainty, our full assurance of the truth and divinity of the great principles of Christianity, and our full assurance that the great principles and facts of Christianity are set forth and recorded with sufficient correctness in the translations or transcripts which we have of the Apostles' writings, are not dependent on the doctrine that the Apostles were infallible. The certainty which you have yourself is not derived from that doctrine; it is derived from something else. Your confidence rests on another foundation. If you had no other foundation on which to rest your confidence in the truth of the great principles of Christianity, you could have no confidence at all; no full, no rational, no well-grounded confidence."

In these and many other well-reasoned passages of this Tract Mr. Barker shows that the common theory of inspiration and infallibility is untenable, and to be of any real service would require a corresponding inspiration and infallibility in translation, transcript, and reader. He therefore is satisfied with claiming for the Scriptures a substantial faithfulness and truth, which are sufficient as a sure foundation for the great principles of Christianity, with whose security and truth we need be alone concerned. To the readers of this Periodical these views on the general question will have been long familiar. But the peculiarity we wish to point out is, that in the interval between the publication of the first and the second of these Tracts Mr. Barker's attacks on the common views have crept on, or rather hurried on, from a denial of the canonical authority of the Song of Solomon and the Revelations, but with the admission of the inspiration of all the Holy *Scriptures*, to an overthrow of the peculiar inspiration even of any of the *writers*, and an assertion that they were no more truly inspired than Christians are now,—or, to adhere to his own words, that all the Disciples of Christ are as truly inspired as the Apostles; and these views he hesitates not to give out at once, without, as it were, note of preparation, a sound of war to his five thousand readers, of the working classes, all of whom, or at least as many of them as can be called Christ's Disciples, he counsels to believe themselves inspired,—"as truly inspired as the first Apostles were." They are such rapid transitions as these, and such, as it appears to us, inconsiderate use of words and advancement of claims, that are either nothing or monstrous,—

which has made us sometimes pause and await the issue of Mr. Barker's career. Still, there is a steady though a rapid progress in his inquiries, always in a right direction, and almost always on a sound foundation. His successive discoveries leave the mainstay of his faith unshaken. He is so convinced of the worth of Christianity that no result of criticism or reflection, in reference to the authority of documents or men, can cause him a moment's doubt. He has abided the change of his convictions on the mode in which the Scriptures are to be received with firmness, and regards them still as containing the oracles of God.

May he abide with equal firmness the change which will next come over him in reference to the true ground on which chiefly rests the authority of Christ himself. We are deceived if he will not shortly become highly discontented with the mode in which writers on the evidences have hitherto too exclusively treated their subject. Let him pass this ordeal with firm step and clear eye, and we shall breathe more freely for our Reformer.

Of the strictly Theological Tracts, the above are the only two that have struck us, as presenting anything remarkable in doctrine, or out of the usual current of Unitarian controversial writing. The tracts on Atonement by Mr. Barker, those on the Satisfaction Theory, Jewish Sacrifices, and others, by a very intelligent and thoughtful coadjutor, who designates himself a layman, adopt views long held by Unitarians; but maintained with a freshness of manner and individuality of style which mark independence and reflection. Of all the theological tracts we would single out as the most perfect of their kind, two on Saving Faith. We have parted with these, else we would have laid some passages before our readers, with which, as exposures of the usual confused orthodox condition of mind on this subject, they could not fail to be exceedingly delighted. Our Tract Societies could not receive an influx of better works for circulation among Trinitarians from any quarter than from Mr. Barker's press,—always, however, with a careful and discriminating selection, for we regret to say that there is another class of subjects on which Mr. Barker writes and prints most copiously, from his views on which we are separated by a mountain of disagreement. They are all more or less connected with the science of politics and political economy, of which science Mr. Barker betrays the profoundest contempt; and if we were inclined to use so harsh a word of one whose mind, character, and ability we respect so highly, we should add, the profoundest ignorance. It is not that we disagree with Mr. Barker in the Anti-Christian nature of all war, for example, on which matter we should go with him farther, perhaps, than most of our readers. It is not that we

disagree with him in his desire to make the spirit of the gospel the standard of action and legislation in all Christian countries—nor in his conviction that spiritual and not material wealth should be the ambition of the Christian. But we disagree with him when he declares that a Christian should not be cognizant of such a thing as government or legislation in the world—that he should not interfere for the amendment of the laws of his country, or recognize its rulers—that he should, in fact, own no other visible standard of law than the gospel, and regard all other laws and law-makers as non-existent or as curses. We think, on the contrary, that human legislation is of slow growth, that to bring it into accordance with the spirit of the Gospel is the work, and must be the effort of ages. That the Gospel is not, and never can be, a legislative standard. It is spirit, and it is power. Men acknowledging that spirit and power as supreme, will make their laws as much in accordance with it, as their own convictions are. It cannot provide details suitable for every age and country, but it can provide a spirit competent to guide those details, and into accordance with which those details should more and more be brought. As each age comes to understand the Gospel better than the preceding, it improves its laws in accordance with that improved understanding. If, then, we believe that slave-trading, capital punishment, oath-taking, war-making, are all opposed to the spirit of the Gospel, we shall never rest till we have influenced the mind of the community, and through it the mind of the Legislator to the same view. We will not consent to let the Legislator's power remain unguided. We will not consent to his might exercising itself without right. We will make our convictions heard and felt in the courts of human law, and will not listen to Mr. Barker, when he tells us that it is not fitting for a Christian man to take part in an election, or to recognize the existence of such a person as a magistrate. We will endeavour to make our law conform to our gospel, and as we think that this can only be done by the successive efforts of successive generations, we will not strive to grow up in a kind of church by ourselves, leaving the laws and the law-makers to heathenism without. We are quite confident that if Jesus Christ could not convert by his personal ministry the Jewish people to the kingdom of Heaven, that if eighteen centuries, during which his legacy of peace has been ours, have not sufficed to induce anything more than a decided *improvement* in our laws and customs, no efforts, however strenuous, of Mr. Barker's, will overthrow the present system of society, deep-rooted as we think it is in human nature, and that a persevering effort to bring our laws, by successive

ameliorations, more into accordance with the spirit of our master, and that, too, by influencing the judgment of society at large, as well as by direct bearing on the seats of power, will do more for the christianizing of mankind than such exhibitions of moral confusion as that we now proceed to quote, which we grieve to say is not unique in the tracts before us.

"It is as inconsistent for a Christian to be a judge, a law-maker, a gaoler, a hangman, a lawyer, or a magistrate, as it is for him to be a soldier, or the captain of a press-gang. It would be as difficult to seize and confine all the murderers, as it would be to seize and confine all the madmen. There are more murderers in the world, in my judgment, than some people imagine. I consider all soldiers murderers, from the pioneer to the commander-in-chief; and how could I seize and confine all them? I consider the common sort of kings and legislators, of magistrates, judges, and lawyers, of jurymen, gaolers, hangmen, prosecutors and legal witnesses, of bigots, sectarians, and persecutors, of drunkards, publicans, brewers, distillers, and spirit-sellers, murderers. I also consider gamblers, horse-racers, poachers, fox-hunters, and the common kind of game keepers, as murderers. The authors, the publishers, and the sellers of bad books, the general run of newspaper editors, a great multitude of the preachers and professors of religion, some archdeacons and bishops, all the advocates of infidelity and licentious principles, all the physical-force men in politics, all duellists, all the makers and sellers of murderous weapons, all rich niggards and all rich spendthrifts, all selfish and oppressive masters, all that do not love their brethren, I consider murderers in the eye of God. And how should I seize and confine all those?"

And yet all this is mixed up with the most exquisite statements of Christian doctrine as to the treatment of the erring and the criminal, that the most refined Philanthropist could desire to see.

Mr. Barker has also a crusade against the whole system of property or material life. But he has probably a printing press which is his own, and a chair and a table at which he writes, which are also his own,; and if so, he is in the same category as the man who has a large manufactory which he calls his own, and a damask couch and rosewood table. We are convinced that if any one entered Mr. Barker's house and took away his press and table, he would not bring the thief before the magistrate, and we think if any one burnt the manufacturer's property, and stole his sofa, he would bring him before the magistrate. We are of opinion that if a man takes by force that which does not belong to him, he ought to be taught better, and we had rather that he were taught this by the magistrate, and by personal restraint, than not taught at all. But we agree with Mr. Barker that there are better modes of teaching the crimi-

nality of theft than those now practised, and we look for their gradual introduction into the social system of our country. Mr. Barker thinks it would be wrong for a man to lay anything by against old age, sickness, or for his family, in case of his death. He strongly objects, therefore, to provident institutions, or insurance societies. We, on the contrary, especially in a country like our own, think that there is more self-denial and independence in dividing our means between the present and the future, between ourselves and our children, than in consuming all on the present, and leaving our future, whether in the persons of ourselves or in those of our children, to our neighbours to care for. If Mr. Barker, having a loaf of bread, divides it between to-day and to-morrow, and keeps his children to eat it with him at his own board, he puts himself in the same category as the man who lays by a portion of his income, for sickness or old age, or for insurance for his family in case of death. We can easily believe that Mr. Barker has seen so much of worldly care among spiritual professors, that his judgment has been distorted by his disgust. There is a problem in morals, which forms the great difficulty with most thinkers, but with the solution of which Mr. Barker does not concern himself—the problem we speak of is the *via media*.

Against all material life Mr. B. is a great declaimer: everything that contributes to the refinement and decorations of our outward being he abominates. No ornament so beautiful to his mind as a printing-press, no colour so splendid as Japan. We have a strong suspicion that Mr. Barker has more than one room in his dwelling, that he has, perhaps, a carpet on the floor of one of them, at least that he has a white table-cloth on his neat board at some period in the day, and that he usually wears good black broad cloth. Mr. B. may inveigh against the palace and its luxuries, but until we see him like Diogenes in his tub, nay without any tub, and without any coat, we shall maintain that he is in the same category with Prince Albert. We believe that a taste for neat and commodious dwellings, and for the wonderful productions of Nature and Art, has more to do with moral advancement than Mr. Barker thinks that it has: and we certainly can do nothing more than smile, when at the conclusion of an excellent Essay on "Inconsistency corrected," wherein is most strikingly pointed out the difference between a zeal for words and a zeal for things, a zeal for the mode of Christ's hypostatical union, and a zeal for the mind of Christ, and the manner of his life, we find the reader conducted as a result to these august and solemn "Resolutions:"

"*I am resolved* not to allow myself to form a taste for *curio-*

sities of any kind. I will not begin to make collections of *spars, minerals, precious stones, shells, flies, birds, autographs, prints, paintings, portraits, or rare books!*" What would Mr. Barker have said to something far worse than any of these—"the alabaster box of ointment, that might have been sold for three hundred pence, and given to the poor?"

A prominent feature of the Tracts before us is invective against hired and hireling ministers. A more detestable character than a hireling minister we do not know among those whom the world calls respectable—a man who trades in religion, who reads prayers because he is paid for it, and reckons up his account with the Gospel at so much an hour. We say, amen, therefore, to Mr. Barker's powerful denunciation of a hireling ministry. At the same time we bear in mind a distinction which we think is Carlyle's, between the man who lives to labour, and the man who labours to live. The first makes his work the great thing, and values the leisure or the means of which he has command, for their use to him in his labour. The second makes his livelihood the great thing, and values his occupation only as ministering to this end. The last may opprobriously be called a hireling, but the first is hired. As long as we think labour of all sorts honourable, and labour of the highest sort most honourable, as long as we remember the apostolic maxim, "The labourer is worthy of his hire," we shall not be ashamed of being hired ministers. Mr. Barker is a hired minister. Much as he has struggled to get out of this denomination, he is in it still. We give him one of three choices—to live upon air, to live upon his own property, or to live on what he receives for his labour. The first he cannot do, the second he would not do, and, accordingly, the third he must do. Mr. Barker preaches, travels, writes, and prints, and all in the work of the ministry; for this labour he receives a return in voluntary offerings, or in regular payments. The free-minded minister among the Voluntary Churches of this country does no more. He says, "I wish to devote myself to the work of the Christian ministry," and those who join him in the wish provide him with what they consider sufficient means to enable him to carry out his purpose. Whether this is done by leaving him something in perpetuity, by taxing themselves annually, or by irregular free-will offerings, the principle is the same. There may be some modes which long usage has made more convenient to the people than others; and if Mr. Barker prefers some different mode, more accordant with his own feelings, those do not become hireling ministers who offer no resistance to the mode voluntarily adopted by the people themselves, nor does Mr. Barker cease to

be a hired minister by adopting a mode of his own. It is a mere matter of convenience and arrangement, and a difference upon it should not form a topic for abuse. We ourselves think Mr. Barker in the wrong; everybody cannot keep in motion such an active press as Mr. Barker's; and if he himself should outlive the demand for his labour in this way, he may find himself regretting his loss of independence and of honourably remunerated employment for a chimera. The truth is, that the man who receives from others nothing, may be a hireling after all; and the man who receives from others all he has, may be as independent as one of the Apostles. It might minister to our pride to live on our own resources; it might minister still more to that pride to live on nothing; but for our humility, our usefulness, and our happiness, the arrangement which prevails may probably be the best; and so long as we keep our minds independent, and esteem our work at its proper value, remembering all the time that there is but one Master to whom we are accountable for it, we shall not feel ourselves greatly debased by receiving carnal things in return for our spiritual. But in this, as in other matters, it is probable that Mr. Barker's personal experience may have led him into his present sweeping censures, and that his pure and noble mind has been disgusted by the money-seeking, grasping spirit of avarice which he has encountered in some of his walks of life.

We have left but little room to comment on the remarkable Tract on Public Prayer, but as we think it is one in which, with the purest intentions, Mr. B. has most mistaken the spirit of religion and devotion we must briefly indicate our objections to it. He says, "I was led, some time ago, to give up the practice of public singing and prayer before and after preaching, and in mixed assemblies generally," because he does not like the chance to which it exposes him, of joining "with unbelievers or profligates in singing or in praying to God." He also believes that Christ did not sanction public prayer in mixed assemblies. Now here Mr. Barker adopts the theory of most churches; that there are in Christian countries two sets of people, one worthy of being admitted into the Church, and one properly excluded from it. In this theory all the persecution and spiritual pride, which have characterized the churches founded within the broad realms of Christendom, have originated. There is none but God can judge the heart, and the man whom we exclude is often better than the man whom we admit. In such a church the publican of St. Luke would have been excluded, and the Pharisee admitted, but Christ reversed the judgment. We think an opi-

nion wrong, and reject a man as an infidel; we think a practice wrong, and reject him as a sinner. The opinion may be true, and the practice, though blameworthy, may be less blameworthy in the eye of God than that of another man to whom Christian communion is still preserved. This theory has been made the excuse for all the bloodshed, persecution and cruelty which has disgraced the Christian Church, and however mildly and judiciously Mr. Barker may personally act up to it, he has revived one of the most dangerous and detestable principles known to ecclesiastical History.

Does not Mr. Barker know that one of the arrangements of a bygone ecclesiastical age, an arrangement under cover of which the most odious ecclesiastical tyranny found exercise, was that the heretic or the transgressor should in one stage be excluded from the Church altogether, in the next, admitted to hear the sermon, in the third, admitted to join the common prayer, and lastly, readmitted to the sacrament, while all the time, perhaps, as must have sometimes, at least, been the case, the Priest himself was a viler sinner, and a more hardened infidel, but only also a more accomplished hypocrite, than the victimized transgressor? Verily when we think how heedlessly the best men can reforge the chains from which they have themselves escaped, we rejoice that the magistrate and the world have still the power in this country which they possess, and that we have our freedom under the carelessness of the infidel, rather than our slavery under the zeal of the priest.

We cannot help offering prayer with the infidel and profligate even if we would. We have known Atheists belong to strictly orthodox churches, and partake of the sacrament with them, and for years none but the Almighty knew. We have a very humble opinion of the perfections of even the best of human beings, and we like even the best, when bent before the throne of God, to feel themselves no better than the worst. As all distinctions of social caste should vanish in social prayer, and the prince and the beggar feel equally humbled before the throne of Almighty Power, so should it be with the saint and the sinner when bowed in prayer before all-perfect Goodness—no distinctions of moral caste should be felt to exist among them. The sinner may offer in that mixed assembly a more earnest prayer than the saint, and be converted by that prayer from the error of his ways. So far from our declining to join in prayer with the infidel and the profligate, we deliberately profess that the only assembly for prayer with which we would not join, would be that where men had dared to suppose they had cast out the

tares, and kept nothing but the wheat—an assembly not of profound humility, but of odious pride; an assembly of presumption and the most wretched Pharisaism. We are not aware either on what ground it can be said that Christ never joined in prayer with the infidel and the profligate. Prayer, if we mistake not, was a regular part of the synagogue service, at the time of our Lord, and he was a frequent participant in that service. If there be one service of religion more than another, by which the sinner is likely to be moved to repentance, it is that of the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man. Mr. Barker, we are sure, would pray with one sinner, and why not when two or three are gathered together, who are after all sinners like that one. It may not be at all times advisable to invite to prayer those who are met for the intellectual examination of a subject, such as often forms the topic of a public lecture, though we are ourselves favourable even at such an hour to the humanizing, solemnizing influence of prayer, and think there can scarcely be a meeter preparation for the exercise of our candour in judging, and our industry in learning.

And here we take leave of our author and his Tracts. We have emulated his own spirit of freedom in commenting on some of his views, because we think them egregiously mistaken. We think that they have been acted out, over and over again in the world's history, and always with ultimate signal failure. We are sure Mr. Barker would regret as evils a general pauperism and a general asceticism; he would regret to see civilization put back, and barbarism and isolation take its place. But we think these are the necessary results of many of his principles; not that these results will ever take place, because the principles will never gain a sufficient hold of man. In all these matters we regard Mr. Barker simply as warring against Providence, just as much as Robert Owen, when he says that homes are dens of selfishness, and individual possessions are the curse of society, and seeks to have children and goods flung together into one large common warehouse of humanity, by way of mending the laws of Providence, which have decreed that parents shall love their own children better than other people's, and that man shall toil and suffer more willingly and successfully for himself and his family than for an indiscriminate community.

With regard to Mr. Barker himself, we do not know one man in the British Empire, for whose moral nature we have a more profound respect. As a Christian man we take him to our heart of hearts. As a moral and religious Reformer we think there may be a career before him unrivalled since the time of Knox. But

if his influence is to be extensive while he lives, or to continue after he himself is removed, he must weigh human nature in larger balances, and study human history on a wider social and historic field. In the meantime he has with him our heartiest good wishes, our liveliest affections, our friendliest co-operation and our sincerest respect.

C. W.

Art. X.—SERMONS ON THE DISSENTERS' CHAPELS ACT.

1. *Eternal Salvation not dependent on Correctness of Belief. A Sermon, preached at Essex-street Chapel, London, on Wednesday, May 19th, 1844, being the Nineteenth Anniversary of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association.* By William Gaskell, M.A. London.

2. *A Sermon, on occasion of the second reading of the Dissenters' Chapels Bill in the House of Commons, preached on Sunday, June 9th, 1844, at Knutsford.* By Henry Green, A.M. London.

3. *Christian Liberty. A Sermon delivered in the Presbyterian Chapel, Chester, July 28th,* 1844. By the Rev. Mortimer Maurice. London.

4. *The Christianity of the Age in advance of Christian Churches. A Discourse on the passing of the Dissenters' Chapels Act, delivered at Hull, July 21st,* 1844. By Edward Higginson. London.

5. *Calumny Repelled, and the Argument Inverted. Two Discourses, delivered in the Unitarian Church, Stockport, on Sunday, August 25th,* 1844, *being the day set apart for a special thanksgiving to Almighty God, for the passing of the Dissenters' Chapels Bill.* By William Smith. London.

Of the many discourses to which the progress and ultimate enactment of the Dissenters' Chapels Bill gave rise, it might have been expected that more would be published than we have yet seen announced. Perhaps, however, the very universality of the interest felt (not a single Unitarian pulpit, probably, being silent on the occasion) may have tended to deter individuals from publishing thoughts, which, they might suppose, had suggested themselves to all. It is pleasing to the sympathies of all, however, to find their own thoughts and feelings expressed by others; and we shall therefore venture to introduce some of the reflections which seem appropriate to the occasion in our notice of the above discourses. Various degrees of enthusiasm have been manifested, we believe, notwithstanding a general similarity in the train of reflections. While some have lauded the measure in strains of poetry and eloquence as a deliverance, little less

wonderful and memorable than that of the Israelites from Egypt, others have looked upon it as a mere, sober settlement of certain rights of property, whilst others again have pronounced it bungling and defective. For our own part we think a degree of enthusiasm fairly due, not merely to the measure itself, but to the manner and spirit in which it was brought forward and advocated. We think, too, that an occasional exhibition of enthusiasm is a healthy symptom, especially among the friends of religious liberty, who are apt to be deficient in warmth, much though they need it to sustain them against the less pure heat of their opponents; and the recent occasion has shown that eloquent warmth is not necessarily incompatible with impartial and disinterested justice. It seemed to us, we confess, natural and appropriate that many ministers should take advantage of the anniversary of the ever-memorable Bartholomew's Day, as the most fitting time to review the progress of religious liberty, and thankfully to contrast the trying position of their persecuted forefathers with their own newly-acknowledged and assured rights.

We have been glad to perceive, so far as we know, a total absence of anything like sectarian triumph on the late occasion. Those for whose immediate benefit the measure was passed, have universally and justly regarded it as not in the least degree a concession to their religious opinions, but simply as an act of impartial justice, for which to be thankful and of which to be worthy. A triumphant victory was, indeed, obtained, but it was the victory of justice and religious liberty over bigotry and misapprehension. The sermons at the head of these remarks are all, we think, characterised by a becoming spirit.

1. The first sermon in our list was delivered while the measure was in progress, and contains no marked reference to it, though the minds of both preacher and hearers no doubt frequently reverted to the parliamentary discussion, some points in which were closely related to the topics of the discourse. The subject is treated with elegance, with power and with singular clearness. The idea which the preacher combats is made to appear so glaringly untenable, that we ask ourselves, during the perusal, if it can really have been entertained, and only the recurrence of facts too notorious to be denied and too plain to be mistaken, convinces us that the preacher is not combatting a monster of his fancy. He draws his arguments, first, from the nature of the Christian records—their unsystematic character—the total absence in them of any care to define the particular articles, belief in which was necessary to salvation; secondly, from the laws which govern the human mind, showing the inevitably

different conclusions at which different minds arrive, even after careful and conscientious study, and the consequent impossibility of attaching merit or demerit to the conclusions themselves. After quoting part of the humble and serious retractation of his opinions by the learned and pious Dr. Whitby in his old age, Mr. Gaskell proceeds :—

"Now can the veriest bigot to orthodoxy maintain, that for such a change of views, induced by the progress of truth-loving inquiry, this learned and laborious divine, or any one actuated by a like spirit of sincerity, could really forfeit his claim to be regarded as a Christian, or bring into jeopardy his eternal salvation? If he can so maintain, then certainly must he be compelled, at the same time, to maintain, that the Bible alone is not a safe guide, and that from the discharge of an honourable duty—a duty in express conformity with the teachings of Scripture—a man may bring himself into a worse spiritual condition than he was before; that it might have been better for him never to have obeyed his Lord's injunction to 'judge for himself what was right,' but contentedly and lazily have made over the keeping of his soul to the care of others.

"How, too, we may ask in this connection, would it be with one who was just on the point of arriving at a true faith, and had every desire to do so, if, before it was actually attained, he were summoned away by death to another scene? Would the advances which he had made go for nothing? Would his right-mindedness prepare him only to meet the sentence of perdition? Take the case of the Apostles. It is the opinion now, I believe, of the most eminent orthodox writers, that till after the resurrection of our Lord, they were unacquainted with what are so generally regarded as the peculiar, saving doctrines of the Gospel. They certainly comprehended not the spiritual nature of his kingdom. Are we to believe, then, that if on the night of the last supper the spirit of one of them had quitted this world—say of the warm-hearted Peter, or of the loving and beloved John—it would have dropped from the side of heavenly purity and holiness into the black abyss of the damned?"

In the third head of his sermon the author argues from the nature of the effects which have followed the mission of Christianity, that correctness of belief cannot be indispensable to salvation. Had it been so, its mission would altogether have failed, since the same doctrines have continually by turns been upheld as essential to salvation, and condemned as fatal heresy.

"For a long period, Catholicism held almost unlimited sway; would the zealots, who now delight in pouring forth burning invectives against it, and heaping upon it charges of idolatry and blasphemy, maintain that during so many ages the goodness of God was entirely frustrated in its object—that Christianity utterly missed of its end? This they must do, so long as they continue to recognize salvation only in right-be-

lieving. They will fail to see how all the while it was doing a saving work, by impressing itself through the senses on the undeveloped mind and rude heart of humanity, calling into exercise its deepest feelings of awe and veneration, shedding a softening influence over its passions and affections, and gradually preparing it for far higher revelations of the splendour of its power, and the glory of its love.

"If time would permit, it would not be difficult to show that to the want of that unity of opinion, which on the common view could only furnish a subject for regret, might be traced, if not the continued existence of Christianity in the world, at least very much of its life and progress. And, amidst all the innumerable diversities of belief which spread themselves around us, take the sincere professors of each, and compare them together, and how little appears the difference in the great features of their characters! They all agree in loving God, in loving Christ, in loving their fellow men. They all agree in anticipating a day of judgment, when sin shall meet its fearful reckoning, and goodness find its issue in unspeakable glory. They all agree in reverencing the volume which enshrines their faith, in binding its beautiful lessons on their memories, and filling their minds with its sanctifying spirit, and opening their hearts to its cheering words of promise and its soothing accents of hope. And can it be, that amongst any of those who seem to approach so nearly to one another here, such an awful distinction as is sometimes represented is really to be made hereafter?"

An idea is here thrown out, on which another excellent sermon might be written. The latter part of the extract reminds us of a favourite passage of ours* from the pen of Mr. Gaskell's colleague, to whom he appropriately inscribes a discourse so congenial with his spirit. Mr. Gaskell argues, fourthly, from the difficulties and uncertainties attending the interpretation of the Scriptures, amidst which, he remarks, it is almost impious to suppose that the merciful Father can have suspended an eternity of anguish on an erring choice. Notwithstanding a savage declaration which the author quotes from the Westminster Confession of Faith, he expresses a sentiment with which his whole discourse makes us strongly sympathise, when he says—

"I cannot bring myself to suppose that there are any, who, in their inmost souls, do believe that a compassionate God can have laid myriads of his creatures under the sentence of perdition, simply because his providence had so cast their lot that it was impossible for them to gain a knowledge of the truth. If any do so believe, not for the whole world would I have my mind darkened with their conception of Him, in whose hands creation's destinies rest. Beneath its gloomy shade, every bursting feeling of gratitude, every springing emotion of love, every blessed germ of trust and hope would shrivel up, and wither away. Instead of

* The One and Vital Faith of Christians: A Sermon. By J. G. Robberds, pp. 6—8.

thinking of God as 'not willing that any should perish,' I should have to imagine him as eager to condemn. Instead of looking to heaven to see a Father's face, I should cast my eyes on the earth, and walk ever in fear of the black scowl that was over me. But if this is not to be believed, then, according to the common idea of orthodoxy, it had been better for many, who have sat at the feet of Jesus with an earnest wish to learn the right—and amongst them some of the noblest spirits that have walked this world, such as Milton, and Newton, and Locke, and Priestley, and Channing—that they should have remained in all the darkness of heathen ignorance. The great gift of God's grace has proved to them only the gift of perdition. What they took to be a robe of righteousness, from the hand of love, has turned out to be a poisoned garment which has treacherously eaten into the life of their souls."

The allusion in the last sentence will not escape the classical reader. The author concludes this portion of his argument with the just and well-expressed remark, that "Orthodoxy necessitates Popery. The former without the latter becomes a cruel mockery of man's weakness, and a foul calumny on God's goodness." We cannot refrain from extracting the following description of the true nature of Christian salvation:—

"Without any qualification from points of belief, our Lord declares that 'the pure in heart shall see God,' and that 'whosoever shall *do* the will of his Father who is in heaven, the same is his brother, and sister, and mother.' What the apostles, too, evidently sought most of all to produce was the subjection of the soul to the moral power of Christ—a believing with the heart unto righteousness. And wherein lies the mighty magic of an assent to a series of propositions however true? Whence springs its exclusively saving efficacy—its eternal merit? Not in the mere assent; for without sufficient evidence it would be irrational, and with it it becomes unavoidable. Not in the mere correctness of the propositions; for what, in the sight of Omniscience, must be the highest mental accuracy that can ever pertain to man, save a weak glimmering of light deep buried in clouds of ignorance! But that holy trust in God—that child-like reliance on Him, which is ever ready to hearken to the voice of his love, and to follow the leading of his hand through light and through darkness, through calm and through storm—that life-glorifying and death-conquering faith which Christ displayed—this has nothing mystical in its power to save. It brings man to surrender up his being unreservedly to the guidance of infinite wisdom and infinite goodness—to walk with God as with a Father, beneath the shield of his Omnipotence. What truer safety, what higher salvation can be found than this?"

The following declaration naturally succeeds the contemplation of his subject, and is naturally and simply expressed:—

"I cannot tell how other Christian teachers may be affected by the idea which I have been combatting, but I feel that if it were mine I

should never dare to venture an opinion on any of the great controverted points of belief. I should say to myself, 'How can I know whether the words that I utter, though uttered in deepest sincerity, may not be the means of conveying a totally false impression to the minds of my hearers, and so of setting them on the way to destruction? I will hold my peace.'"

Mr. Gaskell then points out, in a passage full of eloquence, the evil tendencies of such an idea,—to crush the intellect, bribing and terrifying it to repose (without daring to inquire) in certain conclusions — to foster secret doubts — to prevent Christianity "from coming freely and fairly into contact with the spirits of men"—to make religion "the worship of some veiled idol of deformity, and not the adoration of a pure spirit, whose essence is truth;" and also, "to give false notions in regard to Christian excellence," "turning away the thoughts from moral goodness to fix them on mental correctness." Naturally connected with this—

"Another evil effect of this idea is, that it leads to arrogance and exclusiveness, and poisons the sweet charities of life in that which should be their purest source. The penalty overhanging erroneous belief is so tremendous, that no wonder men dare not imagine that they can be mistaken. It is a thought too fearful. They naturally come, therefore, to assume something of the tone and bearing of infallibility—to lose sight of the fact that they are equally disciples with those who most widely differ from them, and have no better right to decide what the Master teaches than they have, and can arrive at no fuller assurance of the truth.

"It might sometimes make one smile, if it had not something too pitiful in it, to see the manner in which men, under the influence of this idea, will set up their creed, and call on others to bow down their minds before it, and then begin indignantly to charge with 'pride of reason' such as feel unable conscientiously to obey. They seem to be totally unconscious that the 'pride of reason' is with themselves; that they are in effect saying, 'We cannot be wrong; what we believe must be God's truth; only agree with us, and you will infallibly be right.' * * We find the Romish church denouncing woe for ever on the souls of those who venture but a few short steps from the pale of her communion, and take refuge in the bosom of the establishment. We find this, again, catching the very echo of the rejected hierarchy, and lifting up its threatenings of undoubted perdition against such as have the boldness to question its decrees. And we find Dissenters too, regardless of the anathemas which have been hurled against them by both, learning the same high tone of rebuke, and issuing forth no less authoritative and fearful condemnations against those who, merely exercising the same liberty which they have exercised, feel constrained to dissent from them. What is to stop the threats, and arrest the curses which are thus sent

flying in every direction? What to hush the angry spirit of contention which is thus awakened, and bring back something like that state of things when, instead of hating, and reviling, and persecuting, it might again be said, 'See how these Christians love one another?' What to hold out the promise of a realization of the Saviour's sublime idea of one universal church, pervaded by one holy and benevolent spirit—the spirit of his own heavenly life? Nothing whatever, as it seems to me, can possibly do this, until the truth be distinctly and thoroughly recognized, that no one can peril his eternal salvation by any opinions to which, in the free exercise of his reason, he is conscientiously led; that he may be ever so much in error, and yet not be guiltily wrong; that

'From every faith,
As every clime, there is a way to heaven.'

In the effects which seem naturally to result from the opposite idea, we have at once an additional evidence against its truth, and a strong appeal to us to do what we are able towards lessening its prevalence. I can scarcely conceive of a view more at variance with the generous spirit of the Gospel; and, if I do not much misread the history of free-thinking in this country, it is one which has been the means of turning away from a thorough consideration of the claims of our holy religion many minds that were noble and true, and that would have done honour to the cause of Christ. Placed over the gate of the temple by human hands, they read this superscription, 'Ye that enter here, leave every reasoning power behind. Believe without doubting what the priests ordain, or everlasting destruction be upon your heads!'"

After remarking that the diffusion of what the preacher believes to be true views of Christianity, and even the exercise of calm, impartial judgment, are greatly impeded by the false idea which he combats, he excellently says—

"But turning from every selfish consideration, what nobler office could we ask—what higher mission could we desire, than that of bearing among contending sects the olive-branch of peace—than that of striking down the walls of partition which stern creeds have interposed between the hearts of brothers, and convincing them that there is a faith which, despite every difference of belief, can work by love?"

The excellence of this discourse has impelled us to give extracts already, perhaps, too copious (since we trust that none of our readers will fail to peruse the whole in its completeness—they will be well repaid), but we cannot refrain from giving the conclusion, tending as it does to correct what we deem an unhealthy and fallacious indifference to opinions among some of the friends of free inquiry (a natural reaction, carried to an erroneous extreme), and well pointing out the kind of salvation which truth really confers on the believer.

"But we need not, therefore, fall into that false liberalism which represents all opinions as pretty much alike, and strives to skin over the wounds produced by differences of faith, instead of trying to pluck out their venomed sting. Surely there may be a holy zeal for truth without any such unholy dogma as that which lies at the heart of orthodoxy, and infuses bitterness into its veins. We cannot believe that the acceptance of our views is essential to acceptance with the great Father of spirits, but we do believe that a purer faith, consistently carried out, will lead to purer practice; we do believe that there is much in prevailing systems which has a tendency to veil the true splendour of the Gospel—much which is false of God and man, and stands in the way of that free and perfect love of both, which is the fulfilling of its law. We cannot maintain that salvation is inseparably bound up with our doctrines, but we do maintain that there is salvation in them from many idle fears, from many baneful restrictions on freedom of thought, from many exclusive feelings, from many tenets that are calculated to lay a load of doubt on the understanding, and of bitterness on the heart. We do believe and maintain that ours is a system which is peculiarly fitted to give 'not the spirit of fear, but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind.' And our duty, therefore, is clear. We have to adorn that system, and to recommend it to others. Let us endeavour to be true to the position in which Divine Providence has placed us. Let us feel it as a high distinction to be joined to that glorious company who in every age have been called to do battle for the right. And though the ignorant may censure, and bigots may curse, and the corrupt may sneer, let us calmly and resolutely labour on, sustained by the faith that our labour shall not be in vain in the Lord, but one day assuredly appear in the establishment of his kingdom of truth, and peace, and love."

Mr. Gaskell's discourse is one which it does us good to read. There is no laboured effort at novelty and originality. We are presented with a calm and graceful, yet able and earnest advocacy of truths, the vast significance of which, from their very plainness and familiarity, we are too apt to forget and underrate, but which this discourse brings back to the mind in fresh and vivid power. It is not a discourse of merely present application and ephemeral interest. It deserves to be regarded as a standard treatise on a topic, which will ever be of the most vital importance until the day (we fear still distant) when the idea which it combats shall exist only as an obsolete barbarism —an antiquated curiosity, infinitely more astounding and horrible than the torture-chambers of the Inquisition.

2. Mr. Green's sermon is a brief outburst of enthusiasm called forth by the noble debate on the second reading of the Bill in the House of Commons. The event has amply justified his anticipation, though it may have seemed at the time some-

what premature to publish a thanksgiving before the blessing was actually secured. After explaining his text (Luke i. 74, 75.) in its original connection, he shows the appropriateness of its spirit to all occasions of deliverance.

"Thus would I have us regard all the instances of blessing granted to us by a gracious Providence. They are calls on us not to glory in wisdom, in strength, or in wealth, but to glory in righteousness and truth, because in these God himself delighteth. We should look on all such instances as voices speaking to us from heaven, reminding us of the great truth,—'From those to whom much is given, much will be required;'—voices inviting us to run, with renewed perseverance, the race for an immortal crown that is set before us, and encouraging us to hope that God will again and again bless all sincere endeavours to widen and extend the influence of true and righteous principles."—pp. 9, 10.

In the following extract the preacher's enthusiasm has, perhaps, exceeded the occasion, and, in the last clause, has betrayed him into a poetical cadence.

"Surely it was a sublime spectacle to see men who have no sympathy with us on religious grounds, and whom we have neither power to aid nor strength to harm—to see them vying to spread over us the broad shield of British justice, because we were but as a handful in the midst of a nation,—the mark at which bigotry delighted to aim, and whom to crush, contending sects united their array."—p. 10.

What follows, breathes an excellent spirit of Christian meekness and temper.

"Not to rejoice at such a manifestation in favour of what we deem the immutable principles of right, would be unnatural: it would show us not deserving of the privilege of being unshackled by the creeds of a bygone age; but why, and in what, do we rejoice? Do we rejoice that those who opposed us,—bitterly, in some instances, unfairly, I believe, in others,—that they are frustrated? No: for this reason, merely, we do not rejoice; for among them are men of sincere conviction, of ardent benevolence, aye, of enlarged charity; and, provided they sought a righteous end by righteous means, we ourselves would rather suffer loss than that their enterprise should have been frustrated:—but we rejoice because claims which we honestly believe to be grounded upon justice and equity have been allowed; we rejoice because the interests of truth have been promoted; we rejoice because the principles of religious liberty have been vindicated, and their operation enlarged; but chiefly do we rejoice because so much of a heaven-born charity has been manifested among professors of opposing creeds, and the one essential precept of the Saviour enforced, that men should do unto others as they would have others do unto them."—pp. 10, 11.

The appropriate moral of the discourse is that the establishment of our privileges brings with it increased responsibilities. To the sermon is appended the petition from the Knutsford congregation in favour of the Bill, presenting an interesting historical claim to their meeting-house, and a striking example of the necessity of the Act as a measure of simple justice. It occurs to us to suggest that a judicious selection from the various petitions presented on the occasion might form a publication of some interest and value.

3. The subject of Mr. Maurice's sermon is strictly indicated by its title—Christian Liberty. It is a clearly-reasoned and well-composed discourse. At the outset it may perhaps strike the reader that, for the occasion on which it was delivered, it adheres rather too closely to the anciently-prescribed usage of sermons (a usage, however, often too much neglected, we think) in the minute explanation of the text (Gal. v. 1.) in its original connection. To detail the obsolete disputes between the Jewish and Gentile Christians, as if they were for the first time made known, seems perhaps a little out of place on an occasion of strong, present interest. The preacher presently adverts, however, to other kinds of bondage from which Christianity tends to make men free, besides that of the Jewish ceremonial law. We cannot quite concur in his definition of "the liberty with which Christ has made us free," as "the liberty of private judgment." The definition seems to us imperfect, presenting a cold and negative view of the mission of Christ, who came, indeed, to detach men from evil, but by revealing positive and glorious good. *Christian* liberty certainly *includes* the liberty of private judgment, but it includes also, we think, a hopeful, elevating faith—an earnest devotion of the mind to Christian principles and affections. The most perfect liberty that man can enjoy consists in the most perfect obedience to the Christian law of love. We quite agree, however, with Mr. Maurice that "it has been the great and serious mistake of Christian churches to give too dogmatical and confined a view of the Christian system of interpretation." The argumentative portion of the sermon naturally goes over some of the same ground as that traversed by Mr. Gaskell in the discourse noticed above. Mr. Maurice then proceeds to trace the origin and history of Presbyterian Dissent, beginning with an appropriate reference to the immortal Two Thousand.

"By one of the unrighteous Acts, which religious bigotry or perhaps state policy dictated, in the reign of Charles the Second—by the Act of Uniformity, which demanded, among other concessions, from all clergy-

men and teachers, subscription of 'unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained in the Book of Common Prayer,'—two thousand ministers of religion, who valued the rights of conscience more than the means of subsistence, were driven from the bosom of the Church, and thrown upon the guidance of Providence with only his secret consolations, and their own conscious rectitude of intention to support them under persecution. This noble band of outcasts from episcopal sympathy and ecclesiastical honours, bore with them the germs of the true spirit of religious liberty. They might not have differed in doctrinal opinion very materially from their persecutors; but the right of private judgment was attacked. It was the principle of interference with freedom of thought to which they objected—the presumption that it was lawful to dictate in matters of faith, which they opposed—the infringement of the rights of conscience, against which they resolved to testify—the subjection of their souls and tongues to confessions imposed by human authority, to which they would not bend."—p. 10.

The liberty of judgment which they bequeathed to their descendants, and to which the latter firmly adhered, was followed by certain modifications of doctrine, and Mr. Maurice naturally argues, as a fair presumption, that those modifications were approaches to truth.

"Hence, from the legitimate application and extension of the principles of the Reformation, and from the increased activity given to these principles by the persecuting Act of Uniformity, and, I must add, from the natural tendency of unbiassed examination of the Scriptures to induce more correct views of their truths, arose Unitarianism, or rather, I would say, it found a renewed existence after a general, though not universal, banishment from the world, occasioned by the corrupting encroachments of oriental philosophy upon the primitive faith. Such is the general history of the congregations in this country now called Presbyterian, from their descent,—or in allusion to their distinctive doctrine—Unitarian."—p. 11.

Mr. Maurice then adverts to the history of the congregation at Chester in particular, to the threatened loss of their meeting-house, and to the happy establishment of their rights. He speaks of the Act as—

"—a measure which recognises the right of Dissenting Congregations to modify their doctrinal views, if they do not violate the conditions of their foundation, and if their opinions stand the test of a certain period of time. There are checks provided upon alterations of doctrine; but these may be salutary, and serve to prevent sudden and enthusiastic changes, which are always open to suspicion."—p. 12.

We trust it may prove so. This is not the time to point out a possible imperfection in the Act; if such there be, we hope

it will not be laid hold of to the detriment of that religious liberty, which, we would fain believe, is now permanently established. We can cordially say with Mr. Maurice that—

"—we rejoice at its enactment, chiefly because it indicates an advance in liberality of sentiment—because it shows that the sense of justice in the public mind (or at least in the highest sphere of public opinion) is paramount to the suggestions of bigotry—and because it is in favour of that principle of progression and improvement and free inquiry, which we think is essential to Christian liberty."—pp. 12, 13.

The following sentences will, we trust, be verified by the religious body to which they are addressed.

"Henceforth we take our stand among our fellow Christians (and thanks be to God our position has at last become recognized by the law of our country) as thorough and uncompromising friends of the right of private judgment. * * * * We set a high value upon our Unitarian views and sentiments, but we value the principles of Christian liberty more."—p. 14.

Mr. Maurice appropriately concludes an excellent sermon with an apposite and truly Christian exhortation by the first occupier of his pulpit, the well-known and venerable Nonconformist, Matthew Henry.

4. Since we commenced our remarks we have been favoured with the following notice of Mr. Higginson's discourse from the pen of an esteemed correspondent. We shall give it to our readers entire, placing it between brackets by way of distinction, and appending one or two remarks of our own.

[*The Christianity of the Age in Advance of Christian Churches.*]

Under the above title Mr. Higginson has written, preached and printed a very spirited and instructive Discourse. He has deviated (which the occasion we conceive justified him in doing) from the usual tone and style of sermons. The publication before us is the address of a newly-liberated man to those newly liberated like himself, and he speaks out accordingly with warmth, energy, and keenness, and yet withal with a certain joyousness, well befitting the occasion. We really commend this Pulpit Speech with great satisfaction to our readers. The opening sentences mark its aim:—

"The practical enjoyment of thorough religious liberty depends upon three things combined:—upon the spirit of the Laws, the spirit of the Age, and the spirit of religious bodies or Churches.

"If the law be intolerant, but the social and religious spirit kindly, then is the persecuting statute a mere dead letter, which, however, passion or malevolence may any day use for private purposes.

"If the spirit of the Age be intolerant, it will soon create for itself persecuting laws.

"If the spirit of religious bodies be so, it will avail itself of such persecuting laws as may exist, and find other worldly weapons in default of, or in addition to those, to put down heresy, and (as is profanely pretended) to do God service.

"But, with an enlightened age and Churches truly Christian, every remnant of persecuting laws will expire from usage, and then be promptly blotted out from the Statute Book."

Mr. Higginson shows that in the affair of the Chapels Bill, the Spirit of the Age was shown in the Parliamentary Majorities, and the Spirit of the Churches in the opposing Petitions; and then follows a good description of that quiet element which exists in all Christian Churches, but which has only opportunity of evincing its tendencies on some such neutral ground as the Spirit of the Age occasionally opens out to it. Speaking of the Dogmas of the Churches, he says,—

"Yet this is not the Spirit of the Age. And the Age must teach the Churches a better Christianity than they preach. If the saints might 'judge the world,' when the new light of their Christianity first fell upon its Heathen ignorance and vice; the Christian world may now righteously judge and earnestly reprove its own teachers, for their technical and narrow notions of the religion which they expound. I would say that the Spirit of the Age better expresses the Spirit of Christianity than do those movements of religious bodies which profess publicly to represent the interests of Christian truth and righteousness. There is, in all Christian Churches, and also keeping itself quietly aloof from them all, a deeply religious spirit and religious feeling, far more honourable to pure and undefiled Christianity, than that which exhibits itself in the conspicuous acts of Churches. There is also a philosophical element in the Spirit of this Age, which tacitly, if not openly, rejects the dogmatism of all creeds as incompatible with the nature of the Human Mind, and therefore irreconcilable with Christianity, if Christianity is from God for Man. And there is a practical and devotional element pervading all good minds, which though it may shrink from the conflict of controversy, and not care to affirm or to deny the hard articles declared to be of saving efficacy, turns involuntarily away from the Church dogma to the Christian Scriptures, and from the alleged saving creed to the known saving religion of the heart and life.

"But this deep sentiment of inward and practical religion does not proclaim itself in the public manifestoes of Churches. Religionists of this spirit are seldom the leading men. They cannot work the iron machinery of sects. They lament the dogmatism which they think they cannot cure. They do not actively make it their own; but passively, 'for peace sake,' they let the onslaught be made in their name. They desire to be freed from the hard pressure of Creeds; but their deliver-

ance could only be wrought through controversy, which is as foreign to their quiet taste. The religious views and feelings of such men are therefore unrepresented in the outward acts of Churches. Their qualifications do not admit of being measured or tested by any palpable standard known to the visible Church. But articles of belief do. And hence Creeds are put forth into public view as constituting the essence of religion, instead of that inward practical faith of the Gospel which pervades all the good of every sect in Christendom. Hence, when Churches speak *as Churches*, they continually do violence to the deeper religious sentiment of unsectarian minds both in those Churches and out of them. Yet the long prescriptive ascendancy of dogmatical creeds enables them to claim and to receive a sort of passive assent from a large portion of society, to whom the Creed is matter of perfect indifference or even of dislike, but whose active resistance to it would be a social martyrdom for which they are not prepared. And thus the cry of Orthodoxy assumes (but very erroneously) to be the voice of the community."

Such is the way in which Mr. Higginson truly accounts for the fact, when he says that the Church may be bigoted, and yet professed members of the Church, finding another medium through which to express themselves, may be tolerant, liberal, and catholic. Many of our Readers will probably sympathize with him when he says, "To all appearance, the cause of religious liberty is far safer in the hands of British Statesmen, though upholders of a Church Establishment, than it would be under the advocacy of an 'Anti-State-Church' movement, if qualified as Orthodox and Evangelical."

Here is a truth which deserves to be told oftener than it is, but can be seldom better told than in these words:—

"These then, and such as these, are the reliable marks of public opinion. In all these we see abundant reason for encouragement, as friends of Religious Liberty and of a Liberal Christianity. Not that they present the immediate prospect of any great accession to our numbers as a sect. *The world is too strong for that.* I repeat, deliberately and emphatically, the world is too strong to allow it. But these symptoms bid us confide cheerfully and persevere manfully. They encourage us to count 'all who are not against us as on our part,' and forbid us to be of faint heart, when those whose faith is more popular would overwhelm us with spiritual insult. Many of you have good reason to know that it requires some degree of moral courage for a man to take his stand as a Unitarian Christian. He has to resist the entreaties and bear the reproaches of his nearest and dearest friends, who (blind guides!) think he can control his own convictions as easily as he or they can change clothes, and that convictions assumed in order to please them, would satisfy the All-seeing God and save the soul of the time-server. If his circumstances are such as to allow of worldly interference, he will have to withstand those palpable arguments addressed to his worldly

interest, perhaps affecting even his comfortable subsistence, which it is the manner of 'the religious world' to bring as auxiliaries to right and safe believing. And if his station in the world places him above the reach of these suggestions, Fashion will plead hard for Orthodoxy and Conformity at once. These things you may set light by. Many of you have done it nobly and religiously. But they are effectual reasons to prevent many persons from joining our unpopular body. To such persons, however, who call themselves liberal in religion, while they swell the numbers of illiberal Churches, the voice of Society, uttered as it has lately been, ought to convey severest reproof; telling them that they themselves, by their own timorousness and time-serving, invite the very bigotry which they dread, and make for themselves the chief part of the worldly peril before which they sacrifice their sincerity. Their fear of the world is the fear of the worst part of it; the better part of mankind would honour them, if they showed that they respect themselves."—C. W.]

The leading idea of Mr. Higginson's discourse is similar, as our readers will perhaps remember, to that with which the article on the Bill in the last number of the *Christian Teacher* set out, viz. that the spirit of the age is making a progress contrary to the apparent direction of the ostensible spirit in Christian churches. If it be so—and we hope it is—the one may be in part a reaction from the other; the leaders of churches may be taking alarm at the growing indifference to theological animosities. It seems at first sight anomalous that the leaders of *Christian* churches, instead of being in advance of the age ("the salt of the earth"), should occupy so degrading a position as that of being opposed to its better tendencies. It must be remembered, however, that the superficial and bigoted, being the most showy and noisy, obtain an apparent predominance far more than in proportion to their numbers and actual influence, and that they really avail little against sound sense, practical wisdom, comprehensiveness, and general cultivation of mind, the constant advance of which diffuses a more just and rational interpretation of Christian principles, and an indisposition for fanatical extremes. There is much truth in the proverb that "a man of understanding is of an excellent spirit." Yet it is an alarming symptom for the progress and influence of Christianity, if men learn quietly to despise and reject its familiar and recognised aspect. There must be a danger of the *true* being confounded and discarded with the *false*. Let us rather hope and endeavour that the wisdom of the age may work out for itself a more worthy representation of Christianity. Mr. Higginson suggests the possibility of a religious movement (such as Joseph Barker is attempting to realise in this country, and has existed for some time in the United States), disowning all controversial

distinctions and adopting simply the appellation "Christian." Whether this could be such as to satisfy all religious minds may be doubtful; it would perhaps be better still, as well as more practicable, if societies of worshippers adopting different opinions could agree to discard the idea of salvation by opinions, on which Mr. Higginson (like Mr. Gaskell) justly lays stress as the great bane of Christian churches. Mr. Higginson remarks that there would be little to choose between an Unitarian and a Trinitarian "orthodoxy," and that the absence of the idea of salvation by opinions would take away the sting from what now passes as the "orthodox" creed. It seems to us, however, that these suppositions imply essential changes in the doctrines themselves. The idea in question could not easily be attached to the doctrines of Unitarianism, because they represent salvation as consisting merely in an effect produced upon the individual character. At all events their conjunction with such an idea would be a gratuitous and extraneous, if not inconsistent addition. On the other hand we do not see how the idea can be separated from the creed received as "orthodox," without some material alteration of the creed itself. How is it logically possible to maintain the prevalent view of the atonement (viz. that all men are by nature under eternal condemnation, and can be saved only through faith in the blood of Christ as a satisfaction for sin) without maintaining also that those who have not this faith cannot be saved? Mr. Higginson admits that the doctrine never yet *has been* held without this inference, and we do not see how it *can be;* it seems to be implied in the very definition of the doctrine. Far be it from us to compel men against their will to follow out the bad consequences which logically follow from their views. We would much rather that they were illogical than intolerant. But when a doctrine necessarily involves an intolerant dogma, we think it well to point out its inconsistency both with the better part of human nature and with the spirit of Christ, that men may be led to question the validity of the doctrine, and thus avoid the danger of being betrayed into its evil consequences. Those who logically hold such a doctrine may abstain from persecution on the ground of its practical *inefficacy*—its tendency even to promote what it aims to put down—but, on any other ground, the utmost persecution becomes to them a most urgent duty of Christian benevolence. In this point of view, doctrines are of more importance in themselves than some seem inclined to admit. Though all forms of Christian profession may comprise much that is *good*, they are not all equally separable from the tremendous *evil* of claiming exclusive salvation for themselves.

5. The title page of Mr. Smith's publication might give strangers to understand that the government had not contented itself with passing the Dissenters' Chapels Bill, but had also proclaimed a day for a special thanksgiving on the occasion, or at least that some ecclesiastical authority had dictated such an observance; the whole truth being that some ministers in England (most, we believe, in Ireland) agreed in adopting the Sunday following Bartholomew's Day as the most appropriate for commemorating the event. We make this remark, the publication before us being expressly addressed to strangers rather than to Unitarians themselves.

The first of the two sermons, after recurring to both the memorable events affecting religious liberty, with which, by a curious coincidence, Bartholomew's Day is associated, presents a carefully written historical explanation and defence of the justice and necessity of the Bill, and touches upon general questions relating to endowments, which were discussed in the article, before referred to, in the last number of this periodical. After adducing proofs of the refusal of the early Presbyterians to require in their churches subscription to articles of faith, and stating the absence in their trust-deeds of doctrinal declarations, except of the most comprehensive kind, he says,—

"Now what is the natural conclusion from these facts and this silence? Surely, that whatever opinions our Presbyterian forefathers may have held on the doctrine of the Trinity and other allied doctrines, they esteemed their profession as inferior in importance to the rights of unbiassed inquiry, and were less afraid of their descendants becoming Unitarians, than of their narrowing the bounds of Christian liberty by creeds or confessions of faith. The natural presumption is, and it can be shown to be correct, from posthumous authorities in the handwriting of some of these very persons, that many of the founders of our chapels were Unitarians, and were only restrained from a profession of their faith by the legal penalties consequent upon its avowal. Nor can it be doubted that, could they have foreseen the change in opinion, which the large and liberal spirit of their trust deeds not merely sanctioned, but invited, they would still have preferred that their pious benefactions should be enjoyed by a church, however heretical in doctrine, which maintained inviolable their principles of Christian liberty, than that they should pass to those who bound themselves by the shackles of a creed, and narrowed inquiry by a standard of religious belief. If the founders of our chapels had desired to bind their descendants to a belief in the Trinity, why not court popularity, secure indemnity, and obtain their object by inserting, in their deeds, express conditions to that effect? By departing from this course, in the face of the clear declarations both of the Blasphemy Act and the Act of Toleration, they showed, as manifestly as the law permitted them to do, that the support of Trinitarian

opinions was as remote from their wish, as the provisions of their deeds varied from those, which the necessities of the times naturally dictated and required.

"Where, then, is there any ground for the assertion, that the Unitarian Congregations of the present day have committed any injustice, by their retention of the congregational property which has descended to them from their Presbyterian ancestors? If we be not entitled to this property—we who hold the principles of free inquiry, and the sufficiency of scripture—what possible claim can be made by those who infringe the characteristic feature of English Presbyterianism, by the adoption of a creed or a confession?"

He thus affirms the justice of the measure in question, and points out the proper application of it in the spirit of his appropriate text (Acts ix. 31.):—

"Let it no longer be alleged, that we have infringed any rights belonging to others, or that the Dissenters' Chapels Bill confers upon us any right, not previously conceded by the circumstances of the case. The only injustice committed, has been the alienation, on the grounds of abstract legality, of a portion of the property which was ours, by the probable intention of the donors, by the recognized rights of descent, and by the unalienable prerogatives of possession, and which was only estranged by reviving the penal provisions of a law, almost from the first inoperative in practice, and long since blotted from our statute book, by the wiser and more Christian legislation of the present age. It remains for us not so much to rejoice over the disappointed murmurs of defeated bigotry, as to thank God, and take courage for the future, from the evidence of better and more generous feeling, which the discussion of the question has elicited in the high halls of national legislation, and among unbiassed professors of all religious sects. It is for us to profit by the calm now granted to our churches. A time of discussion and controversy may call forth a temporary interest, and rally around us the excitable and the curious; but the testimony of history confirms the experience of the apostle in our text, that a time of rest is alone the period for calm and solid edification. It is when churches are disenthralled from the control of man, and walk in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Spirit, that they add to their numbers men, whose adhesion is of value, and who adorn, by holy lives, a profession of the faith once delivered to the saints of old.

"May such be our experience, and may we find in the now secure possession of our Christian liberties, an additional motive to religious exertion, and an additional encouragement to labour for the diffusion of those sound principles of equity and charity, which have ever distinguished our churches, and have constituted their true glory, while they have apparently created their temporary perils."

Mr. Smith then proceeds to extend the application of the principle partially recognized by the Bill, in language which,

however just, would not, we fear, have promoted the passing of the Bill, had it been uttered in the Parliamentary debates.

"It is monstrous to suppose, that the mere possession of property can confer upon any man the natural right of binding or bribing a number of succeeding generations, to hold the opinions he has adopted, either in religion, politics, or literature. No man can naturally have such a right, and no law should confer it, and the reasons are obvious. Religious opinion, to be of any value, should be the honest conviction of the mind, and not the purchased profession of the lip. Political opinion should rest on the accumulated experience of all times, and not consist of the crystallized prejudices of one age or one man; and literary eminence must surely look over all humanity, and not content itself with the dwarfish standard of one intelligence. Endowments which fix opinions are, therefore, injurious, by nature invalid, and no law should lend them the sanction of its authority. All such endowments are not only inherently unjust, they have proved themselves practically inefficient."

Then follows a declamation against the English Universities, rather one-sided, perhaps, though certainly in the main well-founded. This seems to us, however, to have been a little out of place on an occasion of "thanksgiving" for a measure favourably affecting religious liberty, in the promotion of which men educated at those very universities distinguished themselves by their surpassing eloquence, their fulness of knowledge, their comprehensiveness of view, their liberal feeling, their spirit of justice, and their moral resolution. Nor can we commend (even in a "pulpit-*speech*") the taste of such conceits as "well fed and well feed," and "Burns lit not his burning torch at their gilded shrine." With equal severity and perhaps less fairness—and, as it seems to us, with the same inappropriateness to the occasion—he inveighs against the practical operation of the Established Church, many of the members of which have certainly shown of late a better appreciation of the principles of religious liberty than those Dissenters who have been foremost and loudest in claiming *their own* right of private judgment. We cordially concur, however, in the remark which follows:—

"Disadvantages such as these, inherent in every endowment which binds its possessors to fixed professions or opinions, can only be remedied by permitting public utility to correct private folly and caprice: by giving to the living generation a power to rise superior to the prejudices of the dead; by rendering invalid every testamentary condition, that attempts to interfere with the free current of opinion, or bind, by fixed rules, the progress of knowledge and the advance of science."

Mr. Smith makes some amends to the Established Church by introducing most appropriately, at the close of his first sermon,

a passage, admirable in its spirit and temper, from "the excellent Bishop Burnett, on the passing of the Act of Toleration."

Mr. Smith's second discourse (from Acts v. 29) is occupied in showing that the argument used against the Bill was contrary to the true principle of Protestantism. After briefly sketching the history of the Reformation, and stating the grounds on which the Reformers rested, he proceeds:—

"These were the fundamental 'principles of the Reformation,' viz., the sufficiency of scripture, the right of private judgment, and the duty of fearless, free inquiry. The very name of Protestant is derived from the circumstance of the reformers protesting against a decree of the emperor Charles V., who forbade further innovation on the doctrines and ceremonies of the Romish church. This proves that 'the right of free inquiry' was the great privilege for which the reformers contended, for which they dared to brave the anger of their sovereign and the displeasure of the pope. Protestants have acquired their name, not by protesting against the doctrinal errors of Papistry, but by refusing obedience to a decree, which assumed the lawfulness of imposing, and the duty of obeying the commands of man in the province of religion. The principles of the Reformation, therefore, are not contained in any peculiar creed; they are inconsistent with the imposition of any formula of religious belief; for the very essence of Protestantism is the rejection of all human authority in matters of religion, and the assertion of the supreme authority of God." * * *
"The assertion of the rights of conscience—the denial of human authority in matters of religion—the completeness and sufficiency of scripture as a rule of faith and practice—these were the glorious objects that inspired the reformers with a common zeal, and endowed them all with a common name. Are they not sufficient? Or must these men, who roused millions to thought and inquiry, who rescued the Bible from the hands of priestly cupidity, and made it the freeman's heritage, be blackened by the applause of sectarian exclusiveness, and held up as deniers of their own principles, as having but escaped from the slavery of Popish authority, to bow their hearts and souls under the servitude of creeds and confessions, of assemblies or of synods?"

In the selection of "Calvin and Servetus," among other examples, to prove that the Reformers were not united for the advocacy of particular doctrines, because they differed from one another in opinion, it seems to us that Mr. Smith has chosen rather an unfortunate illustration. The illustration, to be available for his argument, must imply that there was an amicable difference on doctrinal points in mutual concession of the right of private judgment. We need not remind our readers that the burning of Servetus by Calvin, for heresy (that is, for differing from *him*), was one of the most flagrant proofs that the Reformers were too apt to lose sight, with respect to one another,

of those principles on which each rested in justification of himself. How difficult does it seem for men to practise that simplest of precepts—"Do unto others as ye would that others should do unto you." Mr. Smith truly observes, however, that the instances of intolerance in the early Reformers proved only that they were inconsistent with their own principles, and forgot the grounds on which they had themselves separated from the Romish Church:—

"This must be admitted, or else the horrors of the Inquisition are sanctioned by the gospel of brotherhood and peace—Protestantism becomes another name for persecution, and shrinks into a paltry imitation of the greater tyranny of Rome. If it is possible to believe, that the exercise of spiritual authority is sanctioned by Protestantism, then Protestantism itself becomes an impious schism. But surely it cannot have been a schismatic presumption to have given freedom to the human mind, liberty to the enslaved conscience, and the scriptures of truth to the benighted soul. When, therefore, the reformers neglected this, their appointed work, and dared to arrest the onward march of inquiry, and virtually denied the efficiency of scripture, by framing a creed to explain the oracles of God, they acted inconsistently. Their error is forgotten in the greatness of the benefits they conferred upon the world; but great is his guilt, who seeks in their imperfection a justification of his own bigotry, or who sullies their well-earned fame by ascribing to systematic principle, errors and failings which had their origin in the weakness of human nature and the ignorance of a half-enlightened age."

In the spirit of the last remark we fully concur. Mr. Smith justly claims for the English Presbyterians the honour of having consistently and stedfastly recognised and cherished the true principles of Protestantism. It is always to be borne in mind, however, that a small and persecuted body has an obvious interest in maintaining those principles, because it is the party to derive present benefit from their operation—just as the poor have a selfish motive for advocating the duty of benevolence. But the Presbyterians have adhered firmly to their principles in times when there was no such inducement, and we trust they will ever continue to do so, whatever favourable changes their position may undergo.

We extract Mr. Smith's spirited conclusion:—

"The controversy which has agitated our community, will have served a better purpose than merely confirming us in the possession of our congregational property, if it bring the true principles of religious liberty more clearly into light, and refer the regards of Christian churches more frequently to those great and generous principles recognized by the leaders of the Reformation, but which have been too often compromised by their descendants, above all in the unprotestant alliance of

church and state, and the unholy attempt to secure uniformity by bribes and threats, by creeds and articles. We trust in God that the day of such human devices is fast hastening to its close, to be succeeded by a period of better knowledge and holier effort; when churches will rely more upon the native energies of truth, and less upon lifeless formularies, and esteem an honest heart and holy conversation as better evidences of a right faith, than the repetition of a creed, however pure, or an adhesion to a church, however orthodox."

A copy of the Bill, as finally passed, is appended to these sermons.

On reviewing the brief but interesting period in the history of religious liberty, which gave rise to the discourses under our notice, it occurs to us to remark on the temporary bond of union, and energetic, concerted action among the Unitarians, of which it was the occasion. The question arises—How far is it to be wished that these results should be permanent? Some of our readers may remember that one of the reasons advanced bythe 'Leeds Mercury' *in favour* of the Dissenters' Chapels Bill, was, that the legal persecution to which the Unitarians would otherwise be subject, would inflame their zeal and thus extend their pernicious errors. Hence, according to this authority, the Unitarians, had they consulted their interests as a *sect*, would have *opposed* the Bill. We trust, however, that whatever is valuable in Unitarianism does not require the adventitious aid of that spirit of opposition, produced by a sense of injustice. The *zeal* derived from such a source is not a genuine, elevated earnestness in behalf of what is true and good. We would hope that the sense of deliverance from temporary alarm may incite the Unitarians to put forth that *strength* which can result only from *union*, in the promotion of whatever they deem great, generous and practically important principles. Their denominational name, it is true, from the circumstances of its origin, is in itself somewhat cold, technical and narrow; but "what 's in a name?" There are broad and noble views of human duty and human hopes, which they are peculiarly free to advocate, and which it is their peculiar mission to uphold. In their devotion to these let the primitive meaning of their name be lost amid the better associations which they gather round it; and with such objects of interest and effort let them not be too sensitively afraid of "sectarian" co-operation. In this world the *soul* of good cannot be manifested without a *body* to enshrine it and to work out its suggestions.

J. R.

END OF THE SIXTH VOLUME.

GTU Library
3 2400 00270 0304